

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOV 13 1945

# Anglican Theological Review



EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT and BURTON S. EASTON

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

---

VOLUME XXVII

OCTOBER, 1945

NUMBER 4

---

## CONTENTS

The Social Responsibility of the Christian and of the Church	
	Angus Dun 219
The Didache, Barnabas, and the Doctrina	Edgar J. Goodspeed 228
Syrian Coin Hoards and the Tribute Question	
	J. Spencer Kennard, Jr. 248
Early Christian Baptism	Frederick C. Grant 253
Personal and Social Implications of Baptism	Reuel L. Howe 264
The Anglican Communion Today (Church Congress Syllabus 40)	John S. Higgins 275
The Teaching of First Peter	Francis Wright Beare 284
Book Reviews	297
Notes on New Books	302

---

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET  
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

\$1.00 A NUMBER

PRINCE AND LEMON STS.  
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

\$3.00 A YEAR

# Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXVII

OCTOBER, 1945

NUMBER 4

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., D.S.Litt., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: THE REV. BURTON SCOTT EASTON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, General Theological Seminary

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. SHERMAN ELBRIDGE JOHNSON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of New Testament, Episcopal Theological School

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D.  
RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D.  
REV. LORING W. BATTEN, D.D.  
PROF. FRANK W. BUCKLER, S.T.D.  
RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D.  
RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D.  
REV. JOSEPH F. FLETCHER, S.T.D.  
REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D.  
REV. H. E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D.  
REV. HERBERT H. GOWEN, D.D.  
RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D.  
PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D.  
REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D.  
REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D.  
REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D.  
REV. LEICESTER C. LEWIS, S.T.D., Ph.D.  
REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, Jr., Ph.D.  
RT. REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D.  
RT. REV. FRANK A. McELWAIN, D.D.

REV. DANIEL A. MCGREGOR, Ph.D.  
REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D.  
REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D.  
REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D.  
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.  
REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D.  
REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D.  
PROF. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, Jr., Ph.D.  
REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D.  
REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D.  
REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D.  
RT. REV. ROBERT E. L. STRIDER, D.D.  
REV. JOHN W. SUTER, Jr., D.D.  
REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, Jr., Th.D.  
RT. REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, D.D.  
RT. REV. H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, D.D.  
REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D.  
REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D.  
REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D.

## COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut  
THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH  
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, Philadelphia  
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City

NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin  
TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut  
TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia  
SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn numbers. Subscription price \$3.00 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. S. E. Johnson, 6 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.





# Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXVII

OCTOBER, 1945

NUMBER 4

## THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHRISTIAN AND OF THE CHURCH

*By ANGUS DUN*

Bishop of Washington

We can all agree that the Christian and the Church stand under certain familiar commandments. There is no obscurity as to what comes first. "The first of all the commandments is this, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength.'" To love God as Christ means it, is not to love a self-engrossed deity pleased with a maximum of attention. To love the God whom Christ both served and revealed, is to love a Creator and Sustainer of life, a Redeemer of life, a Sanctifier of life—of my life and of my neighbor's. To love God, in the Christian meaning of the word, is to love the life-giving Father, the redeeming Son, the sanctifying and fellowship-giving Spirit. The God who calls us into his service is himself faced toward the world and deeply involved in it. The human will that is given to him is carried back straightway by his will into the service of his world.

Therefore the second commandment, under which the Christian and the Church stand, follows directly from the

first, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." In the language of a great Swiss interpreter, Emil Brunner, "We have no one to serve but God, nothing to do but to serve God." But, "There is no service of God that is not a service of men."

What is this love towards men which God in Christ commands? There are many varieties of love which appear spontaneously in human relationships and need no command to call them into being, many degrees of natural liking and companionship, esthetic attraction, romantic affection, sex attraction, parental and filial love, and friendship. The love which is so essential in discipleship towards Christ finds its closest natural analogy in brotherly love within a healthy family. It is a heartfelt recognition of my kinship with the other, and of his worth, not merely as one whose claims put a just check on my egoism, but as one who has my interests, whose hurts and successes matter to me. It is a sense of our belonging to each other because we both belong to someone else.

This is the kind of love we find in a

family which fulfills the family idea. My brother shares with me in the common life; from the beginning he has been called into being and nourished and watched over and cared for by the same love that willed me into being and nourished and watched over me, and cared for me. In that relationship we are equal sharers. In nothing else are we equal—in age, ability, strength, knowledge, temperament, viewpoint, vocation, character. There is not even a guarantee that we shall be especially congenial.

My love for a brother in the natural family is manifested in the fact that I suffer in his sufferings and rejoice in his successes, that I will his life and its fullness. It is a kind of love; it is more than calculating justice or abstract good will; it has heart in it, it cares, it is concerned with the person and his well-being, irrespective of his rights or deserts or worthiness or gifts. I cannot dissolve the relationship without dissolving my relationship with the life that gave me life.

We must recognize, of course, that such love towards all sorts and conditions of men is a preposterous demand, save as it is rooted in and nourished by the love of God and the love of Christ. It is a fruit of the Spirit. It is a gift of grace, the product of life in Christ, something supernatural. It is not a nice, sensible rule by which my self-interest and other people's self-interest can be whipped together and come out smooth. One of the most familiar Christian terms for brotherly love in action is service. Servanthood is everyman's calling in Christ. Service is making ourselves, our strength, our resources useful to another life; it is meeting the need or furthering the true

interests of another life, with the means at our disposal.

In the Gospels, the emphasis is on elementary service, on maintaining life, relieving pain, feeding, clothing, healing, giving a cup of cold water. These elementary forms of service to my neighbor's bodily life have obviously played a tremendous part in Christianity. This is not because the Christian ethic rates bodily need as the most important, but because this type of service is the most universally understood language of brotherly love; and love is often quite as much concerned to *show* something by what it does, as to *do* something. It is part of the incarnational character of Christianity that the plainest forms of service are seen as the most adequate expression of the highest love.

Having recognized this, we must recognize, too, that there are many other levels of service, as many as there are levels of need. To live the fullest life, our neighbors need much besides basic economic necessities; they need truth, education, companionship, play, joy, beauty, order, protection from the aggressive egotism of fellow men, just laws, hospitals, good government, and so forth.

It is surprising that the Gospels do not put more emphasis on Christian service as caring for my neighbor's soul. One might almost conclude that we are to clothe and feed our neighbor's body and save our own souls. Yet it is plain that the brotherly love and service which Christ lived and which he kindled in others, emphatically included or headed up in the love and service of souls. The apartness of men from God, their walking the way of destruction, their loss of true joys and heavenly

treasure, their self-enclosedness; these were the needs in men he most felt called to serve, and summoned his closest disciples to serve. The Christian knows that, as someone has put it, "The soul of service to the poor is the service of poor souls."

Two other points perhaps call for mention here; they stand in a complementary relation to each other, and there are often very real strains between them. One is the emphasis which our religion places on freedom. The capacity for deliberate choice is a unique gift of man, distinguishing him from all others of God's creatures. It is seen by Christian faith as an essential part of what is meant by Man's being made in the image of God. Brotherly love is therefore necessarily concerned to make possible for our fellows the largest opportunity for the exercise of freedom. It is committed to standing against every form of slavery, and is uneasy in the face of all external compulsion. That does not mean that the Christian or the Church is to encourage men simply to do what they please irresponsibly, but it does mean that they are committed to seek for men the opportunities for responsible self-determination in every area of life, educational, political, and economic; even while they know that the only perfect freedom is in the service of God.

Complementary to this is the Christian's commitment to strive always for the up-building and extension of fellowship or community. We are so made that we not only need one another's service at many levels, but we need equally personal fellowship or life in community. Love creates fellowship and seeks to extend it; the Christian sees in fellowship a main element in

what is meant by the will of God, or the Kingdom of God.

Having reviewed the basic commitments under which the Christian and the Church stand, let us go on to explore some aspects of the actual situation in which the Christian and the Church find themselves. Our relationships are rarely, if ever, what we might call purely personal. We approximate such relationships in leisure-time social intercourse, where John Jones meets James Smith simply as man to man for the satisfactions of friendship or sociability. But most of our meetings with our fellows are conditioned in varying degrees by our positions in society. That is notably true in all public life. By our "position in society," I do not mean what is frequently referred to as "social position," though even that may play a considerable part in our relationships. I refer to the plain fact, in addition to being fellow members of the human race, or neighbors, or children of God, we stand in a complicated mixture of special social relationships to one another. Another human being or child of God may be my wife or father or son in a family setting; my neighbor may be my master, servant, boss, employee; he may be tax collector, rent collector, plumber, friend, enemy, Negro, Chinese, or white American. These special facts about us are all bound up with the forms of relationship or social patterns that are operative in human society and the parts we and our fellows play. These special facts greatly affect our dealings with one another, over and above the circumstances that my neighbor—whether he or she—may charm me, bore me, irritate me, fascinate me, cheer me, tempt me, help me, or hurt me. Many of these special facts about

me and my neighbor are only very partially of my choosing or of his; they are largely matters of destiny.

The christian command is surely not that the brotherly relationship should simply obliterate all these other relationships; if it did, it would be irrelevant for our life on earth. It would even destroy the very life I am commanded to serve. Human life cannot go on without the relationship of the sexes, the relationship of parents and children; without the economic order—that is, without production and distribution and exchange; or without the political order. The groupings of physical characteristics and cultural traditions, to which we give the debated name of race, also belong to our unchosen inheritance. The obscure but powerful thing we call nationality is rooted in a long sharing of common soil, customs, language, together with shared social memories and hopes. Along with these great structural patterns of society go the minor, but in some ways more intimate, ones, largely associated with leisure time and sociability, classes, cliques, clubs, interest groups, and so on. No one, I suppose, will deny that there are considerable difficulties in maintaining a brotherly relationship or brotherly love with those we employ or those who employ us; with those of other races, set apart from ours by deeply rooted and irrational fears and prejudices; with our economic rivals; and most of all, with those who are our enemies in war. It is common now to speak of our Japanese enemies as belonging to the level of animals, because that avoids some of our inner conflict in the brutal business of war. A strong and realistic man might have to pass a harsh judgment on his brother; he

might even have to strike him down if his brother ran amuck; but what a tragic and inwardly disturbing relationship that would be. I am not a pacifist, but I do not think we are dealing honestly with our Christian commitment if we do not recognize that it is far from congenial with the business of war, and therefore not an unqualifiedly good morale-builder for war purposes.

To will God's world I must, in large measure, will these basic human institutions and relationships; yet many of the ugliest and most divisive things in our world are clearly bound up with these institutions and relationships. Should we say that the Christian demand is that the brotherly relationship be thrown around all other relationships and work as a leaven in all of them?

Christian thought has from the beginning viewed the great orders of relationships in which men find themselves, as rooted in the purpose of the Creator-God. Male and female created he them; he instituted marriage as an honorable estate; he bade them subdue the earth and bring it into the service of mankind; he gave men divers gifts and skills; he saw men's needs of law and government, and raised up judges and rulers. These are not things to be regretted or escaped; they are a part of God's will for us. In marriage and parenthood and the nurture of children; in work and production and in the exchange of services; in the maintenance of order and justice and the defense of liberty; in all these we carry out the purposes of creation and find concrete opportunities for serving God and our fellows.

But there is another and darker side to all this; sin is deeply entrenched in

all these human institutions, and they are all corrupted and disturbed by that fact. This is the view of traditional Christianity, and I confess to finding it much more true to the facts of life than some of the later variants heavily diluted by modern sentimental optimism. Man's godlessness, disorderliness, pride, selfishness—all facets of sin—have seriously infected the orders of relationship in which men stand toward one another.

One could illustrate this endlessly. In the purpose of God, human work is meant to be for an enrichment of man's life and of God's world by bringing the materials of creation under the control of intelligent purpose. The variety of our gifts and needs and situations is meant to be an occasion and opportunity for mutual service. Production is meant to be for use; ownership, for the Christian, is always stewardship, with no absolute rights. Actually, our economic systems are very largely motivated by pretty crude self-interest, though merely individual self-interest is controlled and modified in many beneficent ways by family feeling, friendliness, patriotism, as well as by the leaven of a concern for just dealing fed into our inheritance by our Jewish and Christian tradition. We have to appeal to self-interest, or the profit motive, to keep the thing going. Our problem is how to harness self-interest so it will work reasonably well for the common good.

Diversity among what we call races can add to the richness and interest of life, the several human types supplementing one another. Actually, these diversities become an occasion for group pride and utterly irrational feelings of superiority. The more powerful race enslaves the weaker; then when the economic and social results have ripened

into bitter fruit, the slaves are freed. The "superior" race has deep feelings of fear and guilt; it bars the weaker race from ordinary economic opportunities, which restricts cultural and educational opportunities, which incapacitates for normal political life and breeds dullness of will and lowered physical vitality. As a result, the "superior" race is more convinced than ever of its inherent superiority. A vicious circle is set up, and no man of either race can escape the consequences of its in his dealings across the racial line.

It would not require much imagination to illustrate the wages of sin in the political order, on either the national or the international scale.

I have gone into all these matters because I do not see any other way to set truly the background for a consideration of the social tasks and responsibilities of the Christian or of the Church.

A Christian, we agree, is to seek first to do God's will and to serve his Maker, and to bring up his children to servanthood and brotherly relationships, and to ask no more of society than what he needs to perform his service, and to strive always to extend fellowship and true community, and to widen the areas of freedom for his fellows. I do not see how any understanding Christian could deny that. I do not want to idealize this individual Christian; he is not a perfect man; his pride and irritability and self-interest and evasiveness often get the better of him. But let us imagine him as an earnest, humble, charitable man.

The primary place to serve God and man is in the position one occupies. And there is no order of relationship so bad that it does not provide very many

opportunities for brotherly service. But is it a Christian's business simply to accept as fixed and inevitable the economic, political, racial, educational systems in which he finds himself? Shall he take the position that the only thing that matters is faith and prayer and a converted heart? That one system is as good as another, or that if only enough people are made Christians, everything will work out?

If this man whom we are imagining took the Gospels as a kind of law book, he would not have much incentive to concern himself greatly with the institutions of society. Those Gospels recognize fully that my neighbor's life is a bodily life, and that to serve him is to serve his body. They do not bring out the fact, which is pretty plain to us, that my neighbor's life is set in a social body or social order, and that its condition affect his well-being, yes, his spiritual well-being, almost as directly as the health or disease of his body affect his spirit. If our imagined Christian man were the owner, or even part-owner, of a bus that was carrying children to school or men to work, and the tires were so dangerously worn or the car so incompetently driven that the maiming of these lives was threatened, would we not expect him to feel responsible? Is he not a part-owner, or a responsible member, of an economic system, a political system, a system of race relations, that very definitely threaten the life of his neighbors in many ways? Can he, as a Christian, be indifferent to what they do? Is he not concerned with the kind of international order, for example, which we might achieve after the war?

Unemployment is not simply an economic fact and problem; it is a profound social evil with the most devastat-

ing moral and spiritual results. The spirit of an economic system is probably a more efficient educative factor than most of our Sunday schools. Children are more effectively taught by the one that *to succeed is to get*, than they are taught by the other that *to succeed is to serve*. Our caste system, in the realm of race relations, breeds ambitionless frustration, or a cynical bitterness in the outcast race, and that is the negation of God's saving grace. The war-bred attitudes of the average American community toward American citizens of Japanese descent undercut everything for which Christian missions stand.

I do not see how anyone who could be taken seriously as an interpreter of the Christian faith and life would deny the Christian's responsibility for the patterns of social behavior. But having said that, I do not see how anyone who understands the realities he faces, can offer simple, easy solutions for the Christian's wrestling with these problems. He must not be allowed to run away into sentimental, interior piety. He must not be allowed to accept things-as-they-are as the law of God. He must be brought to his knees by his sense of the powers of evil, and of our common need of cleansing and vision and forgiveness, and of the atoning work of Christ. And then he must be set upon his feet to labor as a reconciling, leavening influence in the place where he stands. He won't find that he can simply let down ideal solutions onto very unredeemed man. If he wants to establish better working relations with capital or labor, he will have to deal with actual working men and actual managers. If he wants any kind of world order, he will have to work with Russians and Englishmen and Chinese. If

he sets out to cross the color line, he will have to bear patiently the distrust and threats and alarms of his fellows, and walk warily lest he inflame where he sought to bring peace.

The social task of the Christian, as I understand it, calls for a penitent participation in the life of our sinning human society; the bringing into our actual relationships, whatever they may be, of as much transparent, realistic, simple, reconciling charity as we can draw from communion with Christ. Where we stand will determine where we enter the struggle. Some will be managers, some governors, some powerful, some having a humble place. We shall see things very differently, according to where we stand. There are diversities of gifts, but one spirit. And those who have the one spirit can recognize each other even on the other side of the fence or the conference table or the court room or the national boundaries—yes, even across the battle lines.

What of the Church? One is sometimes tempted to say cynically, "Yes, what of it?"

Whenever we speak of the Church with reference to what it ought to be doing in the world, we are faced with the fact that it has a dual character. On the one hand there is its ideal nature, and what it is for faith. This is what really marks it as the Church. But it has, too, an actual character as a society among other societies made up of people who are far from ideal. Ideally and for faith, it is the company of faithful people, the communion of saints, the body of Christ and the household of God. This is what it is called to be, and its acceptance of this calling marks it as Church. Actually it is made up of

all sorts and conditions of men, representing many positions in human society and certainly various stages of Christian maturity. Its membership is made up of the same people who are citizens, employers, union members, Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Chinese, Negroes. The divisions of the world reappear within the Church just in the measure that it approaches inclusiveness. This is one of the facts that make it far from easy for the Church to achieve a common mind or to act as a body in relation to social issues which touch sensitive interests. And beyond that there are the ecclesiastical divisions which force us to ask, when one speaks of Church, "Which Church do you mean?" For our present purpose we must mean, at least, our own branch of the Church, and the answers we give regarding its social responsibilities will apply to whatever bodies we recognize as churches.

When it is said that the Church ought to do something or say something about this or that, about war or housing or anti-Semitism or the opium trade, I suppose we generally mean that bishops or parsons or the General Convention ought to do or say something. These are all official spokesmen for, or agents of, the Church. But it is necessary to remember that these are all relatively ineffectual save as they can retain a following in the common membership of the Church. And one of the most serious problems we face here is the gap between the specialized clerical mind and the lay outlook.

There are those, of course, who repeatedly say that the Church—meaning Bishops, preachers, and General Convention—ought to keep completely away from political issues or economic policies and such like. I have even heard a

church member say of a program of study for Church young people on race relations, that we ought not to face them with such questions; we ought to stick to something "spiritual." It is far from easy to distinguish clearly the element of truth and the element of falsehood in this attitude. Archbishop Temple, in his fine little book on *Christianity and the Social Order*, speaks of the widespread resentment, even on the part of Christians, against the claim of the Church to be heard in matters of politics or economics. He tells of an incident when a group of bishops asked to be heard regarding an industrial dispute that was seriously disturbing England. Mr. Baldwin, who was then Prime Minister, asked how the Bishops would like it if he referred to the Iron and Steel Federation the revision of the Athanasian Creed. This was supposed to put the bishops back in their place. The trouble with that is not that it puts bishops in their place, but that it approaches very close to an attempt to put God in his place. The truth is that God is concerned in everything that affects man. Christ is Lord of all. The Church cannot withdraw into a corner to deal with a private specialty called religion, and leave vast areas of human life outside its concern. As a matter of fact, whenever men are thoroughly convinced that high human values are involved in any cause, they want the Church to show its hand. We rejoice, don't we, when we hear that the Church in Norway or in Germany has stood up against Nazi tyranny? Isn't that politics?

It is true that the Church's first business is always *to be the Church*, to turn men's thoughts and hearts and wills towards God, to help them see their little

times in the light of God's eternal Kingdom. Its business is faith and prayer and communion with the living Christ and life in the Spirit. And incomparably its greatest service to the world is the quality of character in the men and women it succeeds in sending back into the difficult world of everyday affairs. As Archbishop Temple says in that same book, "Nine-tenths of the work of the Church in the world is done by Christian people fulfilling responsibilities and performing tasks which in themselves are not part of the official system of the Church at all." Without in any way disparaging Church work, it is a far greater achievement to send a man into a bank or a managerial position or the Senate or a shop, who has the imagination to make of that a Christian service, than it is to get him to usher in church or even collect pledges for an every-member canvass. The world cries out for more humble, disinterested, charitable people.

But granting that this is the greatest social service the Church can render, it remains true that the Church should help its own members and the general human community to see our common life in the light of God and his will for us. Has not God passed a terrible judgment on human slavery? Should not the Church raise its voice against human slavery in every form? Has not God passed a terrible judgment on complacent, self-sparing isolationism? Should not the Church proclaim that judgment? Has or has not God made of one blood all races of men to dwell on the face of the earth? Can the Church stand aside while the elemental human rights are denied to many because of race? The Church is called to bear its witness or

die, and if those called to witness fail, then God can raise up witnesses in unlikely places.

True, this is a dangerous and difficult calling under which the Church stands. The Church and her spokesmen can very easily go astray. In all of our major social problems there are highly technical aspects about which brotherly love has, of itself, no special knowledge. Recurrent, long-term unemployment is a curse, but what practicable changes in our economic system will best overcome it, is a technical question on which economists differ. The Church as such can have no program for economic redemption. Isolationism as a moral attitude is sin in Christian terms. Before God, America's terrific power carries with it terrific responsibility for the world order. But what form of world order will best serve the realities of our world situation is a matter on which highly experienced political leaders may well differ. The Church cannot be committed to a particular political program. Yet no political program can operate without a body of tolerable good will and national self-restraint.

The Church must respect the specialties. It must also not forget its own teaching about man's very imperfect state. A part of the uneasiness which men of practical affairs often feel about the public utterances of us preachers, arises from the fact that we appear to be talking about what would be the best

system for saints to live under. Our problem in the political and economic realms is to produce the best results we can out of the motives to which we can actually appeal. An economic system which won't work will not provide men with the elemental order which is our first demand on a political system. And no human system will work which cannot enlist by some means the cooperation of a substantial part of the people who live under it. As we face the terrifying problems of building some kind of world political order, it is difficult to know whether we have more to fear from the cynics, who believe in nothing but the immediate self-interest of their own group, or from the romantic idealists who won't play unless everything can be on the highest plane. The conscientious man of practical affairs has much to teach us. The danger on the other side is that we may settle down complacently with such tolerable working systems as we have, become insensitive to their cruelties and injustices, and cease to hear the Word of God summoning us to seek ever for the doing of his will in his world.

There can be no better words to end with than those which come from our Lord to His disciples in every age: "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" "Ye are the light of the world; a city set upon a hill cannot be hid."

## THE DIDACHE, BARNABAS AND THE DOCTRINA

By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

Los Angeles, California

The Didache and the Doctrina are the Jacob and Esau of early Christian literature: the younger has stolen the elder's birthright. It is now some seventy years since Bryennius found the Greek Didache (1873) and reported it (1875), and more than sixty years since he published its text (1883). The identity of much of its material (chh. 1-6) with that of Barnabas (chh. 18-21) has posed an absorbing problem for learning ever since. For here is literary indebtedness that is unmistakable, but which is the debtor? The problem is further confused, or clarified, by the appearance of two Latin pieces, one of which, ostensibly a translation of Barnabas, stops at the end of ch. 17, being nicely rounded off with a doxology. The other, entitled *De Doctrina Apostolorum*, contains most of the moral injunctions common to Barnabas and Didache (94 out of 102), and would seem to be a translation into Latin of their common source. The history of the four texts would thus appear to be that a short Greek Didache was composed early in the second century (now lost but represented by translation in *De Doctrina*); that a Greek Barnabas was written about A.D. 130, and appears reflected in the Latin version of chh. 1-17; that with the aid of this short form of Barnabas, the primitive Didache was expanded soon after A.D. 150 into the Greek Didache published by Bryennius; and that Barnabas itself in turn was later with the aid of the primitive Didache expanded into the present Greek Barna-

bas. This reconstruction<sup>1</sup> has drawn strong objection from a number of writers, who lean toward the view advanced by Vokes in his *Riddle of the Didache* (1938) that the Greek Didache was dependent upon the Greek Barnabas for the "Two Ways" material as well as other items; and any Greek texts lying back of the Latin forms of Doctrina and Barnabas were drawn from Didache and Barnabas respectively, not vice versa. One scholar indeed is not sure that Doctrina is a translation of a Greek text, and describes such a text as "hypothetical":<sup>2</sup> That would of course mean that the Latin Doctrina was made directly from our present Greek Didache, by excerpting and extending the string of moral injunctions in chh. 1-6, leaving out the gospel quotations, and leaving off 6:3-16:8.

It hardly needs to be observed that early Christian literature usually grew not by partition and reduction, but by combination and expansion. It would be like explaining Jude as excerpted from II Peter, a view which we remember Professor Bigg, of Oxford, did not scruple to maintain. Nor do these scholars attempt to account for the Latin documents, Doctrina and the short Barnabas. Yet these are just as truly documents of early Christian literature as the Greek Barnabas and the Greek Didache, and just as much entitled to consideration and treatment. To one familiar with

<sup>1</sup> As presented in my *History of Early Christian Literature* (1942)..

<sup>2</sup> M. L. W. Laistner, in *Classical Philology*, vol. xxxviii, January, 1943, p. 62.

the development of Christian writings in the first, second and third centuries, the idea that *Doctrina* and the short *Barnabas* were produced, the latter by lopping off the closing chapters 18-21, and the other by first making these closing chapters of *Barnabas* the basis and beginning of the *Didache*, and then excerpting them from the *Didache* directly into Latin, seems about as improbable as the ancient idea that the *Gospel of Mark* was made by condensing *Matthew*.

Mr. Vokes holds that "this Latin *Didache* is a Latin homily, an adaptation of the Greek *Didache* as we now have it in Bryennius's MS, adapted with the assistance of *Barnabas*" (p. 20). The Greek *Didache* he holds made use of *Barnabas*, and derived the "Two Ways" material, as well as some other touches, from it (p. 48). As he dates *Didache* toward the end of the second century or early in the third, *Doctrina* must belong to the third century. Like Dr. Laistner, Vokes thinks of *Doctrina* as composed in Latin, not composed in Greek and then afterwards translated into Latin. Dr. Laistner only observes that "a Latin rendering made before the middle of the second century is almost incredible; . . . later on we should have expected the longer Greek version to be translated, not the hypothetical short one." This seems to leave no room anywhere for the Latin *Doctrina*, and yet it exists and must be dealt with just as faithfully as *Barnabas* or the *Didache*.

If *Doctrina* is a composition of the third century, as both Vokes and Laistner seem inclined to think, it seems to exhibit strangely primitive traits. Its brevity for one thing has an early look. It is too short for a third century homily, for it contains less than seven hundred words and can be read aloud in six min-

utes. Moreover it does not address a congregation but a second person singular throughout. It is even too short for a tract, unless it be a very early one, and that is what it must have been. Nor does it display any of the traits of the period after Irenaeus. Its disposition to offer a definite Christian moral legislation finds its best parallel in *Hermas*, which I should date about A.D. 100. The sins it warns against include the special pagan practices of magic and sorcery with which primitive Christianity came into such sharp collision, as *Acts* shows. That a third century Latin should have taken *Didache* and eliminated from it not only the best preaching it contained but also every mark of Christian thinking and experience of the preceding hundred years is very strange; one wonders how he could do it, and even more why he should do it. If Vokes or Laistner were really concerned about *Doctrina*, they would deal with these problems, but neither takes *Doctrina* very seriously. *Doctrina* shows no trace of the series of heresies that overshadowed the second century—Docetism, Marcionism, Gnosticism, Montanism—nor of the Catholic orthodoxy that had developed over against them. There is no mention at all of doctrine as we understand it; only if you depart from these moral precepts, will you be taught "extra disciplinam." This is certainly much closer in spirit to *Hermas* and his naive legislation than to the third century insistence on sound doctrine.

Vokes argues that the *Didache* is a Montanist document, of about A.D. 200. Hilgenfeld in 1884 and 1885 undertook to point out Montanist touches in the *Didache*, but the whole regulative purpose of the *Didache* is alien and opposed to the free spirit of Montanism, and if

the Didache had been a Montanist document it could hardly have been quoted by Clement and Origen and recommended by Athanasius, or embodied in such orthodox works as the *Didascalia*, and the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Yet this idea has been again advanced and defended at great length by Vokes in his book.

Even before the publication of the *Didache*, Krawutzcky in 1882 had very skilfully reconstructed the primitive source of *Barnabas*, the *Apostolic Church Ordinances* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, as the "Two Ways." The scholars who first examined the *Didache* and compared it with *Barnabas*, were quick to see that some common source about the "Two Ways," supposedly Jewish, lay back of these two documents. Schlecht's discovery of the *De Doctrina Apostolorum*, in 1900, gave learning the very document it had conjectured, and very much as it had reconstructed it. Yet because it was Latin, not Greek, and Christian, not Jewish, and did not fit with perfect nicety the picture that had been made of it, scholars passed it by, and made no place for it in the second century, or in the third, in Greek or Latin Christian literature.<sup>3</sup> But such neglect

<sup>3</sup> The description of the *Doctrina* given by Berthold Altaner (*Patrologie*, 1938, p. 23) as an old Latin translation of chh. 1-6 of the *Didache* is of course altogether mistaken; a translation would hardly have omitted twenty five lines (forty five clauses) of ch. 1, and five of ch. 6, besides omitting single lines here and there and shifting lines freely. Raemers' *Handbook of Patrology*, translated by Tixeront (6th impression, 1939, p. 19), similarly describes *Doctrina* as "a Latin version of the first six chapters" of *Didache*, yet one fifth of the first six chapters of *Didache* is missing from *Doctrina*. Laistner even refers to it as "a Latin version of the *Didache*," though it is hardly one third of the length of *Didache*, and yet is no fragment, being rounded off with a

does not dispose of it; it must be dealt with, and fitted into one's reconstruction of early Christian literature at some point and to some purpose.

Nor is there any real difficulty in doing this. For a close comparison of it with *Didache* and *Barnabas* shows there is really no objection to identifying it with precisely the lost "Two Ways" document long desiderated. *Doctrina* is not indeed that identical document, but a Latin translation of it, and we may well remember that one of the most important documents of second century Greek Christianity, Irenaeus' *Refutation of Gnosticism*, has come down to us, as a whole, only in a Latin translation.

That the Latin translator left out a few lines of his Greek original, even a paragraph or two, is nothing to boggle at. The ease with which such omissions may be made, by ancient scribes and modern scholars, is strikingly shown by the list of biblical books written into the sixth century Codex Claromontanus, which (clearly by mistake) omitted from its list of Pauline letters *Philippians*, I and II *Thessalonians* and perhaps *Hebews* also, between *Ephesians* and *I Timothy*; while Harnack in printing its list has further omitted from it I, II, and III *John* and *Jude*, between *James* and *Barnabas*.<sup>4</sup> Out of a probable thirty one items the List originally contained, the Clermont scribe, or his exemplar, omitted four, and

doxology. These reckless accounts of *Doctrina* continually confuse the problem and obscure the individuality of *Doctrina* as in its own right a document of early Christian literature.

<sup>4</sup> *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments*, p. 76, n. 1; English translation, *The Origin of the New Testament*, p. 114. M. Omont of the Bibliothèque Nationale was kind enough years ago to provide me with a photograph of the pages of Claromontanus containing the list, so that I might determine with certainty its actual contents.

Harnack, four more. The scribe omitted about one eighth of the List, and Harnack about one seventh of what was left of it. This is recited here only to show how easy it is even for a modern scholar to omit a string of short items, especially where what is being copied is not continuous discourse.

Even in a translation, the great bulk of the document is here. Naturally enough, in Didache, which took over the name of the old tract which formed its basis, Doctrina's order is more closely followed, and its substance is more fully reproduced. In the Greek Barnabas, of which it formed only a later appendix and afterthought, less of Doctrina is reproduced, and its order is less regarded.

It must not be forgotten that aside from all external evidence, the internal evidence in both the Greek Barnabas and the Greek Didache strongly suggests disunity. In the middle of ch. 6, Didache bids farewell to "this Way of the Teaching" and turns from moral injunction to prescribing definite church observances—what food to eat, how to baptize, when to fast, how to pray and how often. These the writer introduces with the same artless abruptness with which he has let go of the "Two Ways" tract. "Concerning food," he begins, "bear what you can." This is a favorite way with him for introducing new subjects: "Concerning baptism . . . Concerning the Eucharist . . . Concerning apostles and prophets. . . ."

In the Greek Barnabas the break is less abrupt, but not less noticeable, for it is marked by the crudest of transitions: "Now let us pass to a different Gnosis and Didache. There are Two Ways of Didache and authority. . . ." This practically notifies the reader that he is now going to read the Didache, in some form

or other; but clearly not in the form exhibited by the Greek Didache found by Bryennius.

Both these Greek documents thus encourage the reader to look further for the elements they so clumsily put together, and behold! the Latin Barnabas, lacking the whole Didache section; and the Latin Doctrina, which substantially supplies it.

It would seem to me immediately apparent that the indubitable composition of Didache 1: 3-2: 1 wholly out of materials from Matthew, Luke, I Peter, Hermas (Commandment 2: 4-6), and an unknown work (vs. 6), marks Didache as a secondary, not a primary work. It would at once suggest that what preceded and what followed (1: 1, 2; 2: 2 f.) might also be appropriated from some other work, and the Doctrina proves to reflect just such a work, though in a Latin translation. Didache 1-6 is in fact simply a mosaic made up from very early sources, the chief of which was the Greek original of the Doctrina. To suppose that original to have been produced by cutting away from the Bryennius Didache all the materials from Matthew, Luke, I Peter, Hermas, etc., would seem an unnatural proceeding, almost unprecedented in early Christian literature.

The suggestion of Dr. Laistner<sup>5</sup> that later than the middle of the second century, "with the more rapid growth of Christian communities in the west, we should have expected the longer Greek version [!] to be translated, not the hypothetical short one," loses sight of the fact that church life and usage were moving fast in that very period, and the Greek Didache with its primitive polity

<sup>5</sup> *Classical Philology*, xxxviii (1943), p. 62. The idea of a Latin rendering of the primitive Didache made before A.D. 150 has nothing to do with the problem; no one has suggested it.

and provisions would soon be out of date, especially in the west which was going its own way in such matters under the lead of the Roman church. It is in fact precisely the timeless morals of the *Doctrina* that might survive and be translated for some such Puritan circle as that of Novatian or his successors; not the details of church practice laid down in the *Didache*. They were soon out of date, and had to be rewrought again and again into new and larger church manuals; not preserved in their archaic form. The presumption for a Latin translation is all against the full *Didache* and in favor of the short *Doctrina*; and behold! We have (as yet at least) no Latin version of the *Didache*, but two Latin manuscripts of the *Doctrina*.

Dr. Laistner's doubts of a Greek original back of the Latin *Doctrina* should be allayed by the evident use of its materials in Coptic circles, so liable to Greek influence rather than Latin. In 1895 the researches of Iselin <sup>6</sup> revealed the fact that in the Arabic version of the *Life of Schnudi* (Sinuthius the Monk), the biographer begins by telling how Schnudi always used to say that the road was easy and "the way consisted of Two Ways, one to Life and the other to Death"—proceeding then with the substance not of the *Didache* but of the *Doctrina*, with none of the interpolations from the *Gospels* or *Hermas* which *Didache* contains. The complete text of the Latin *Doctrina* had not then been discovered, but it is now clear that it was that work in substance, not the longer *Didache*, which was the source of this part of the *Life of Schnudi*. Of course it was the Greek original of the short *Doctrina*, or possibly

a Coptic version of it, that was employed by the biographer of Schnudi, who is understood to have written his eulogy of Sinuthius in Coptic. The short *Doctrina* certainly influenced and in part shaped the *Life of Schnudi* and the *Apostolic Church Ordinances*, as well as the Greek *Didache* and the long form of *Barnabas*, and it also passed into a Latin version. In these circumstances it seems strange that students of this literature either neglect it altogether or go so far as to deny its very existence. In view of the great indebtedness of Coptic literature to Greek from which it was largely translated, the use of the *Doctrina* materials in Schnudi would seem to establish the existence of *Doctrina* in Greek, as its reproduction in *Didache*, *Barnabas* and the *Apostolic Church Ordinances* plainly suggests. In these circumstances I should think the existence of a primitive Greek *Didache* corresponding to the Latin *Doctrina* firmly established.

The presence of much of the Two Ways material in the *Apostolic Church Ordinances*, about A.D. 300, has long been recognized. Indeed, the parallels were conveniently set forth side by side with those in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in Hitchcock and Brown's revised edition of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, in 1885, pp. xlvi-lxiv, though the *Church Ordinances* were somewhat confusingly designated as the *Apostolic Canons*. The opening sentence of the *Church Ordinances* is so much like that of *Barnabas* that it must be derived from it: "Greeting, sons and daughters, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." *Barnabas* begins, "Greeting, sons and daughters, in the name of the Lord who has loved us, in peace." But it is plainly not from *Barnabas* but from a form of

<sup>6</sup> L. E. Iselin, "Eine bisher unbekannte Version des ersten Teiles der Apostellehre," Leipzig, 1895 (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xiii, 1).

the Doctrina that the Church Ordinances obtained 83 of the moral injunctions and warnings that it contains. For these include that entire series, nos. 39-56, so strikingly absent from Barnabas. So while the Church Ordinances probably got their opening greeting from Barnabas, they must have derived these 83 items from some form of the Doctrina, presumably its Greek original. These are of course enriched with some later material, but they appear for the most part in just the order that Doctrina has them in. It is only fair to add that at two points (after Doctrina's l. 37 and l. 44) the Church Ordinances has additional elements not found in Doctrina but present in Didache (after 37, "some reprove, and for some pray," and after 44, "Be not lustful, for lust leads to fornication; nor foul-spoken nor one who lifts up his eyes; for all these things breed adulteries"). It would seem that at these points the Greek Doctrina has sustained slight losses, either in the course of its Greek transmission, or in the course of translation, or of its Latin transmission. But these five items combined are slight compared with the loss of Didache 1:3-2:1, a body of thirty eight items, unreflected in Doctrina, Barnabas, Church Ordinances, the Summary of Doctrine, the Fides Nicaena and the Life of Schnudi.

For this is not all. The (Pseudo?) Athanasian "Syntagma, or Summary, of Doctrine," which Harnack dated between 350 and 370, and the "Fides Nicaena," which he dated 375-381, he regarded as resting on a form of the Teaching which lacked 1:3-2:1, but was not confined to the "Two Ways" material alone.<sup>7</sup> These documents may be

consulted in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 28, col. 835 f. and 1637 f. It is true the form of the Teaching which they reflect lacked 1:3-2:1, but I find no trace of Did. 7-16 in either of them, except the casual reference to Wednesday and Friday as the regular Christian fast days. But it did not require the Didache to tell the writer this; he and all his readers must have been familiar with the church practice about fast days; and his neglect of all the rest that Did. 7-16 had to offer is clear evidence that he did not have it. It is clear moreover that the "Fides" is largely based upon the "Summary," much of which it repeats, often with modifications.

Of the 161 items we have listed in the Doctrina, about twenty six can be easily identified in the "Syntagma" and the same twenty six reappear in the "Fides." There is here hardly a detail that could be credited to Didache 1-6 that is not also found in Doctrina, and this trifling variation may be due to the fourth century writers' familiarity with the New Testament, the language of which both occasionally appropriate. Certainly it is the Greek form of the Doctrina, not the Greek Didache, that is reflected in both "Syntagma" and "Fides," and probably the compiler of the "Fides" got his Doctrina materials from the "Syntagma." Yet this is not certain, for sometimes "Fides" form is the more original.

The Doctrina items that are identifiable in "Syntagma" are 10, 11, 16, 15, 19, 18, 20, 29, 28, 31, (49), 55, 127, 20, 21, 46, 32, 38, 77, 90, 59, 60, 34, 95, 96, 153, 154. "Fides" has these in the same order, with few deviations,

The evidence of "Syntagma" and "Fides" then points to the use, direct or indirect, of the Greek Doctrina, not the

<sup>7</sup> *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Litteratur*, I, p. 87.

Greek Didache, in their composition, and they may be added to the four documents already listed, as showing its unmistakable use. Indeed it has now become clear that while the considerable use of Didache's materials in other Christian writings seems to be confined to the Didascalia, late in the third century, and the Apostolic Constitutions, late in the fourth, that of Doctrina can be traced in Didache, Barnabas, the Apostolic Church Ordinances, the Summary of Doctrine, the Fides Nicaena, and the Life of Schnudi. The evidence for its literary influence is much greater than is that for the influence of Didache.

If we now look back to the theory of the origin of Didache given by Vokes, Muilenburg, and apparently Laistner—that Barnabas as a source supplied the Two Ways material to Didache, and that the Doctrina played no part in the development of the subsequent kindred literature, Schnudi, Church Order, Summary of Doctrine, Fides Nicaena, Didascalia, Apostolic Constitutions—their theory seems to be shattered by the fact that the Life of Schnudi, the Apostolic Church Ordinances and the Summary of Doctrine agree in neglecting two thirds of Didache, and the same two thirds: that is, they make no use of 1:3b-2:1 and 6:3-16:8. The natural explanation of this is that they made use not of Didache but of a Greek document lacking just these parts; and just such a document the Greek text lying back of Doctrina would provide.

Neither Didache, Barnabas nor Schnudi contains all the 161 phrases, clauses, or words into which Doctrina (omitting the trinitarian formula at the close) may be divided.

Eight items are present in both Didache and Barnabas but are not recognizable in

### Doctrina:

You shall not show partiality in re-  
proving for transgressions.

You must not forsake the command-  
ments of the Lord.

Duplicity.

Fraud.

You shall confess your sins.

Advocates of the rich, (though Doc-  
trina 151 may be a corruption of this  
and the following)

Unjust judges of the poor.

Utterly sinful.

The last three are especially striking as  
they form a sequence in both Didache  
and Barnabas.

On the other hand ninety four items  
are common to all three writings, Didache,  
Barnabas and Doctrina; one hundred  
and forty five appear in both  
Didache and Doctrina, and one hundred  
and four in both Barnabas and Doctrina.  
Even in the abbreviated form of it in the  
Life of Schnudi, seventy seven parallels  
can be found. These are almost exactly  
the proportions in which Mark was re-  
produced in Matthew (ninety to ninety  
five per cent.), and in Luke (about sixty  
per cent.). Just ninety per cent. of Doc-  
trina appears in Didache, and about sixty  
per cent. of it can be recognized in Barna-  
bas. This only shows that there is noth-  
ing strange in Didache using more of  
Doctrina and Barnabas less. Such were  
the literary habits of the early church.

A few items are present in Barnabas  
and Doctrina, but not in Didache: (the  
ways) of Light and Darkness; angel  
guards set over them; and a larger num-  
ber in Didache and Doctrina but not in  
Barnabas: Life and Death; and most  
strikingly items 39-56 in one block.

The common material appears in Di-  
dache in very much the same order as in

Doctrina, but in Barnabas it is very differently arranged, being very naturally and properly recast and reduced, since it is to form just an appendix—a cauda—to a larger work in a more ambitious key.

But is Doctrina the source of the other two, and did Didache take over about 90 per cent. of its material, interpolating it with material from Mt. 5 and Lk. 6, as well as I Peter and Hermas, while Barnabas took over almost 60 per cent. of it, rearranging it and adding to it here and there? There is much to encourage this view, but the presence of eight substantial items in both Didache and Barnabas which are not in Doctrina is almost fatal to it.

But Doctrina is not an original Greek text but a Latin translation of one, made of course long after the Greek document which it translated was written. Can that Greek document have been the original source of the long artless string of moral injunctions that appear in all three? We should then have to suppose that the eight items (5 per cent. of the whole) were lost either from the Greek original before it was translated, or lost in making the translation. The generally detached character of the style may be said to favor this, and the tendency toward omission on the part of ancient scribes is well known. Clark claimed that the transmission of an ancient Greek or Latin text is like the experience of a traveller who leaves a piece of luggage behind every time he changes cars.

This is the probable solution of the problem, and it does not call for the postulating of any imaginary source, for of course Doctrina is a translation of a (lost) Greek document; it is that lost Greek document, certified by the existence of the Latin version of it, the Doctrina, on which first the writer of Didache

and then the editor of the second edition of Barnabas drew; Didache was a second edition of it.

Both the Teaching of the Apostles and the Letter of Barnabas, in short, underwent expansion. The Teaching was originally simply the original Greek form of Doctrina. After a generation of usefulness it was expanded into the church manual we know as the Didache. Much of it was also embodied in the second edition of Barnabas, soon after A.D. 150, in the "Apostolic Church Ordinances," ca. 300, in the "Summary of Doctrine," 350-370, the "Fides Nicaena," 375-381, and the Coptic "Life of Schnudi." The fuller Greek Didache itself was in time worked into the Didascalia, 250-300, and the Apostolic Constitutions, about 380.

Barnabas, chapters 1-17, was written about A.D. 130, and a generation later was enlarged by the addition of about 60 per cent of the Greek original of the Doctrina. But the first edition of Barnabas continued to circulate, for it was later translated into Latin, without any such additions.

A closer examination of Barnabas' great omission, Doctrina, clauses 39-56, shows that much of it—murder, lust, enchantment, magic, lying, avarice, grumbling—are covered elsewhere in Barnabas, chh. 18-21, mostly in *positive* command, adjusted to a loftier plane of Christian living: Be simple (straightforward) in heart and rich in spirit; As far as you can, you shall be pure. Anger, murder, enchantment, magic, and grumbling are covered either generally or specifically in Barn. 19: 3-11. It is a mistake to suppose Didache superior to Barnabas in its presentation of the Two Ways material; Didache is in fact inferior, for it contains some repetitions which Barnabas strips off. That is,

Didache *copies* the Greek original of Doctrina, Barnabas *rewrites* it. Moreover Barnabas presents not so much vices to be shunned as virtues to be cultivated, a far superior method, of course. The average Christian then as now does not so much need to be told not to murder, rob, lust or lie, as to be kind, generous, pure and true. The editor who added the Two Ways material to Barnabas perceived this. He was not writing to "the heathen" but to a public so familiar with the Hebrew scriptures that they would enjoy the allegories of Barn. 1-17, and naturally so advanced in the Christian life that some rudimentary morals might be taken for granted.

The way of life and the way of death as moral alternatives go back at least as far as Jer. 21:8, "I set before you the way of life and the way of death," with which we may compare Deut. 30:15, Ps. 1:6 and 16:11, Testament of Asher 1: 3-5, and Enoch, ch. 91; but Matt. 7:13 was probably better known to the writer of the original Didache. In fact, first century Christian literature is constantly echoed in it, a point lost sight of by those who would explain it as a work of Jewish origin.

There is nothing in the title *De Doctrina Apostolorum* to suggest that the work bearing it is an excerpt from a larger work, as Vokes intimates (*The Riddle of the Didache*, p. 17). One has only to think of some of Cicero's titles: *De Amicitia*, *De Oratore*, *De Divinatione*, *De Legibus*, *De Officiis*; or of Tertullian's *De Pudicitia*, *De Baptismo*, *De Anima*, *De Virginibus Velandis*, etc. Oblivious of the marked contrast in both matter and interest between Did. 1:1-6:2 and 6:3-15:4, Vokes finds unity and integrity in the document, which is as surprising as Muilenburg's similar judg-

ment about Barnabas,<sup>8</sup> in spite of the startling contrast between its allegorical and its moral sections, not to mention the crudest of all transitions from allegory to morals: "Let us pass to another Gnosis and Didache" (Barn. 18:1). Scholars who do not detect such literary junctures as these naturally are not elated or enlightened when the component parts of Barnabas turn up in actual manuscripts, like the Latin Barnabas which presents ch. 1-17 as a complete work, and the Doctrina, which supplies, though in a Latin version, the probable principal source for the rest of the present Greek Barnabas.

Vokes remarks (p. 47), "Though the Latin version omits the 'Two Ways,' it ends with 'Habes interim de maiestate Christi,' which seems to mark that it is a mere instalment of the whole Epistle." But this loses sight of the context, which has just stated "If I write you about the present and the future, you will not understand, for many things are put in parables. These things are so. Meantime you have, concerning the majesty of Christ, how all things were made unto him and through him. To him be honor, virtue, glory now and for ever and ever." The "interim" alludes to another possible future message, about things present and things to come, which can hardly be a description of Barnabas, chh. 18-21.

The most difficult resemblance between Didache and Doctrina to explain is Doctrina 1. 94, "For the Lord wishes to give of his gifts to all." Didache 1:4 reads, "For the Father wishes that it be given of his own gifts (Gr. *charismatōn*) to all." But in Didache this occurs in the midst of

<sup>8</sup> *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Marburg, 1929, pp. 9, 84, 168.

what is clearly an appropriation from Hermas, Commandment 2: 4-6, where it reads, "For God wishes that it be given of his own gifts (Gr. *dōrēmatōn*) to all." The solution probably is that the compiler of Didache in making up his mosaic from Matt. 5, Lk. 6, I Peter, and Hermas, Commandment 2: 4-6, took this line over with its context from Hermas, and then when he came to the same line in his "Two Ways" source, l. 94, naturally omitted it. Perhaps its occurrence in his Two Ways source recalled its fuller expression in Hermas. As between Hermas and the Greek lying back of Doctrina, the Greek Doctrina probably derived the saying from Hermas, unless both obtained it from some source unknown to us.

The original Teaching of the Apostles ought in short to stand at the beginning of any future critical edition of the Apostolic Fathers, not as a mere source for the more famous Teaching, but for its own sake, as an independent and primitive work of early Christian literature, with which the student and the historian of that literature have to deal. It may even prove to be an effort of a half-Judaistic Christianity to set forth an objective pattern of Christian behavior in the name of the apostles, over against Paul's doctrine of complete reliance upon the inner spiritual light.

Closer scrutiny may indeed lead to slightly different estimates of some of these resemblances, or even to the detection of further resemblance. But such modifications can hardly affect the total impression and the final conclusion, as to the extraordinary extent of the interplay of literary influence among these three documents.

To recapitulate: of the 161 items in

Doctrina 77 can be recognized in the "Life of Schnudi"; 94 in both Didache and Barnabas; 104 in Barnabas; 145 in Didache; and 149 in Didache and Barnabas taken together. The bearing of these figures is unmistakable; Doctrina closely approximates the source of all three of the other documents. It is reasonable to suppose that the original Greek of Doctrina was the source of all the others, as well as of the "Summary of Doctrine" and the "Fides Nicaena." Doctrina is not a Latin version of Didache 1-6, as modern patristic writers carelessly assume. Nor can these relationships be reversed, so as to make Barnabas the source of Didache and Doctrina, or Didache the source of Barnabas and Doctrina.

The prevalent confusion as to the relations of Doctrina, Didache and Barnabas can probably be somewhat relieved by a conspectus of their parallel portions, with some line numbers to guide the reader to actual parallels. I have made the Latin Doctrina our base, numbering its lines in fives, in the old text-book manner; putting after each line of the others the number of the parallel line in Doctrina. So much of the text reappears in the Life of Schnudi that I have included the pertinent parts of it, but not its continuous text. Opinions may differ as to the closeness of some of these parallels, but not so much I think as to affect the general conclusion, that the Greek document of which Doctrina is a translation is the basic "Two Ways" underlying all six—Didache, Barnabas, Church Ordinances, Summary of Doctrine, Fides Nicaena, and Life of Schnudi; and, through the Didache, influencing also the Didascalia and the Apostolic Constitutions.

*De Doctrina Apostolorum*

I. Viae duas sunt in saeculo  
vitae et mortis,  
lucis et tenebrarum.

5 In his constituti sunt angeli duo,  
unus aequitatis,  
alter iniquitatis.  
Distantia autem magna est duarum viarum.  
Via ergo vitae haec est.

10 Primo diliges deum aeternum qui te fecit;  
secundo proximum tuum ut te ipsum.  
Omne autem quod tibi fieri non vis  
alio (corr. alii) non feceris.  
Interpretatio autem horum verborum haec  
est.

*The Teaching (Didache) of the Lord to the Heathen  
by the Twelve Apostles (1)*

i. 1. There are two ways, (2)  
one of life and one of death, (3)  
and there is a great difference between the two  
ways. (8)

2. The way of life is this: (9)  
first, you shall love God, who made you, (10)  
second, your neighbor as yourself; (11)  
and everything that you would not have done to  
you, (12)  
do not do to another. (13)

3. Now the teaching of these words is this: (14)  
Bless those that curse you,  
and pray for your enemies,  
and fast for those that persecute you;  
for what merit is there  
if you love those that love you?  
Do not even the heathen do the same?  
But love those that hate you,  
and you will have no enemy.

4. Abstain from physical [and bodily] cravings.  
If someone strikes you on the right cheek,  
turn the other to him too,  
and you will be perfect.

If anyone forces you to go one mile,  
go two miles with him.

If anyone takes away your coat,  
give him your shirt too.

If anyone takes away what is yours,  
do not demand it back,  
for you cannot.

5. Give to everyone that asks of you,  
and do not demand it back.  
For the Father wishes that from his own gifts it  
should be given to all. (94)

Blessed is he who gives according to the Com-  
mandment;  
for he is innocent.

Woe to him who receives;  
for if a man receives because he is in need,  
he will be innocent;  
but he who receives when he is not in need  
shall stand trial,  
as to why he received and for what,  
and being put in prison  
he will be examined about what he has done,  
and he will not come out of it  
until he pays the last penny.

6. But of this it was also said,  
Let your charity sweat in your hands  
until you know to whom to give.

*The Letter of Barnabas*

xviii. 1. But let us pass to another gnosis and Didache. (1)

There are two ways (2) of teaching (Didache) and power, that of light and that of darkness; (4) and there is a great difference between the two ways. (8)

For on one are stationed light-giving angels (5) of God, (6) on the other, angels of Satan. (7)

2. And the one is Lord from eternity to eternity, while the other is ruler of the present time of iniquity.

xix. 1. This then is the way of light, if anyone wishing to make his way (9) to his appointed place would be zealous in all his works. (60)

The knowledge then that is given us so that we may walk in it is as follows: (14)

2. You shall love your maker, (10) you shall fear your Creator, you shall glorify him who redeemed you from death;

you shall be simple in heart and rich in spirit. You shall not join those who walk in the way of death. (65, 3)

You shall hate everything that is not pleasing to God. (105)

You shall hate all hypocrisy. (104)

You must not forsake the commandments of the Lord.

*The Life of Schnudi*

i. 1. The way consists of Two Ways (2) one to Life, and the other to Death, (3) and there is an important difference between these two ways. (8)

2. And this is the way of life: (9)

Above all things you shall love the Lord your God from your whole heart, from your whole soul, with all your thoughts, (10) and you shall love your neighbor as yourself; (11) And what you do not wish for yourself (12) do not do to another. (13)

*Doctrina*

15 II. Non mechaberis,  
non homicidium facies,  
non falsum testimonium dices,  
non puerum violaberis,  
non fornicaberis,

20 non magica facies,  
non medicamenta mala facies,  
non occides filium in avortum  
nec natum succides,  
non concupisces quicquam de re proximi tui,

25 non perjurabis,  
non male loqueris,  
non eris memor malorum factorum  
nec eris duplex in consilium dandum  
neque bilinguis,

30 tendiculum enim mortis est lingua.  
Non erit verbum tuum vacuum nec mendax.  
Non eris cupidus nec avarus  
nec rapax nec adulator  
nec contentiosus nec malemoris (corr.).

35 Non accipies consilium malum  
adversus proximum tuum.  
Neminem hominem oderis (corr.)  
quosdam amabis super animam tuam.

III. Fili fuge ab homine (omni?) malo  
40 et homine (omni?) sim(ili illi?) (simulatore  
corr.)  
Noli fieri iracundus  
quia iracundia ducit ad homicidium.  
Nec appetens eris malitiae nec animosus.  
De his enim omnibus irae nascentur.

*Didache*

ii. 1. The second commandment of the Teaching  
is:  
2. You shall not murder, (16)  
you shall not commit adultery, (15)  
you shall not corrupt boys, (18)  
you shall not commit fornication, (19)  
you shall not steal,  
you shall not practise magic, (20)  
you shall not use enchantments, (21)  
you shall not murder a child by abortion, (22)  
nor kill one when born; (23)  
you shall not desire your neighbor's goods. (24)  
3. You shall not commit perjury, (25)  
you shall not bear false witness, (17)  
you shall not speak evil, (26)  
you shall not hold a grudge. (27)  
4. You shall not be double-minded, (28)  
or double-tongued, (29)  
for the double tongue is a deadly snare. (30)  
5. Your speech shall not be false or vain, (31)  
but fulfilled in action.  
6. You shall not be covetous (32)  
nor rapacious (33)  
nor a hypocrite  
nor malicious  
nor proud.  
You shall not entertain an evil design (35)  
against your neighbor. (36)  
7. You shall not hate any man, (37)  
but some you shall reprove,  
and for some you shall pray,  
and some you shall love more than your life. (38)  
iii. 1. My child flee from everyone evil, (39)  
and from everyone like him. (40)  
2. Do not be irascible, (41)  
for anger leads to murder, (42)  
nor jealous nor contentious nor passionate; (43)  
for all these things breed murderers. (44)  
3. My child, do not be lustful,  
for lust leads to fornication,  
nor foul-spoken nor one who lifts up his eyes;  
(127)  
for all these things breed adulteries.

*Barnabas*

3. You shall not exalt yourself, (62)  
but shall be humble-minded in all things.  
You shall not take glory to yourself. (63?)  
You shall not form an evil design (35)  
against your neighbor. (36)  
You shall not admit arrogance to your soul. (64)  
4. You shall not commit fornication, (19)  
you shall not commit adultery, (15)  
you shall not corrupt boys. (18)  
The word of God shall not go forth from you amid  
the impurity of any.  
You shall not show favoritism in reprobating any-  
one for transgression. (80? 100?)  
You shall be meek, (57)  
you shall be quiet, (59)  
you shall stand in awe of the words that you have  
heard. (61)  
You shall not hold a grudge against your brother.  
(27)  
5. You must not doubt whether a thing shall be  
or not. (81)  
You must not take the name of the Lord in vain.  
You shall love your neighbor more than your life.  
(11, 38)  
You shall not murder a child by abortion, (22)  
nor kill it when it is born. (23)  
You shall not withhold your hand from your son  
or from your daughter, (95)  
but from their youth up you shall teach them  
the fear of God. (96)  
6. You must not desire your neighbor's goods;  
(24)  
you must not be covetous. (32)

*Schnudi*

3. You shall perform the following acts, one after  
another.  
ii. 1. The first of them is:  
2. You shall not kill, (16)  
you shall not commit adultery, (15)  
you shall not defile yourself through love of what  
is unclean; (18?)  
you shall not commit fornication, (19)  
you shall not steal,  
you shall not practise magic, (20)  
you shall not cause abortion (22)  
through any potions, (21)  
you shall not kill a new-born child, (23)  
you shall not desire any of the property of your  
comrade and your neighbor. (24)  
3. You shall not commit perjury, (25)  
you shall not bear false witness, (17)  
you shall not speak evil of any man, that the  
Lord may not be angry with you. (26)  
4. Of having a divided heart [beware] in all your  
concerns. (28)  
5. You shall not speak falsely or with idle talk.  
(31)  
You shall not diminish the pay of the day-laborer,  
lest he call upon the Lord for help, and be  
heard, for the Lord Jesus Christ is not far from  
us. (80?)  
6. My son, do not be a robber, or a thief, (33)  
or a usurer,  
or a denier of evil.  
My son, do not be proud, for the proud is re-  
jected by God. (64)  
Make no evil design (35)  
against your comrade, your neighbor and your  
debtor; if you have done so, God will love  
him more than you. (36)  
7. My son, hate no man, for they are the image  
of God and like him. (37)  
If a man slips, and through his stumbling falls  
into sin,  
reprove him between you and him alone, as is  
proper in view of your conduct to one another  
and love him as yourself. (38)  
iii. 1. Flee from everyone evil (39)  
and have nothing to do with an evil-doer that  
your life may not be cut short and you die  
before your time.  
2. My son, do not be jealous, or quarrelsome, or  
deceitful, (34)  
for these things lead men to murder. (42)  
3. My son, your care shall not direct itself to lusts,  
for lust leads to fornication.  
My son, do not use foul language, (26)  
nor have a greedy eye (35)  
for these things breed false witness.

*Doctrina*

45 Noli esse mathematicus,  
neque delustrator (3d hd.delusor)  
quae res ducunt ad variam superstitionem,  
nec velis ea videre nec audire.

Noli fieri mendax,  
50 quia mendacium dicit ad furtum,  
neque amator pecuniae nec vanus.  
De his enim omnibus furtiva nascuntur.  
Noli fieri murmuriosus  
quia dicit ad maledictionem.

55 Noli fieri audax, nec male sapiens.  
De his enim omnibus maledictiones nas-  
cuntur.  
Esto autem mansuetus,  
quia mansueti possidebunt sanctam terram.  
Esto patiens

60 et tui negotii bonus  
et tremens omnia verba quae audis.  
Non altabis (corr.) te  
nec honorabis te apud homines,  
nec dabis animae tuae superbiam.

65 Non junges te animo cum altioribus  
sed cum justis humilibusque conversaberis.  
Quae tibi contraria contingunt pro bonis  
excipies  
sciens nihil sine deo fieri.

IV. Qui loquitur tibi verbum domini dei,  
70 memineris die ac nocte,  
revereberis eum quasi dominum.  
Unde enim dominica procedunt,  
ibi et dominus est.

Require autem facies sanctorum  
75 ut te reficias verbis illorum.

Non facies dissensiones.  
Pacifica litigantes.  
Judica juste

sciens quod tu judicaberis.

80 Non deprimes quemquam in casu suo,  
Nec dubitabis verum erit an non erit.

*Didache*

4. My child, do not be a dealer in omens, (45)  
since it leads to idolatry, (120)  
nor an enchanter, nor an astrologer, (46)  
nor a magician, (21)  
and do not wish to look at them, (48)  
for all these things breed idolatry. (47)

5. My child, do not be a liar, (49)  
since lying leads to theft, (50)  
nor avaricious nor vainglorious, (51)  
for all these things breed thefts. (52)

6. My child, do not be a grumbler, (53)  
since it leads to blasphemy, (54)  
nor self-willed nor evil-minded, (55)  
for all these things breed blasphemies; (56)

7. but be meek, (57)  
since the meek will inherit the earth. (58)

8. Be long-suffering and merciful and guileless,  
(59)  
and quiet and good, (60)  
and always revere the words that you have  
heard. (61)

9. You shall not exalt yourself, (62)  
nor admit arrogance to your soul. (64)  
Your soul shall not associate with lofty men, (65)  
but you shall live with righteous and humble men.  
(66)

10. You shall accept the experiences that befall  
you as good, (67)  
knowing that nothing happens without God. (68)

iv. 1. My child, night and day you shall remem-  
ber him (70)  
who speaks the word of God to you, (69)  
and you shall honor him as the Lord, (71)  
for where the Lord's nature is talked of (72)  
there the Lord is. (73)

2. And you shall seek daily the faces of the saints,  
(74)  
to find rest in their words. (75)

3. You shall not cause division, (76)  
but you shall reconcile fighters. (77)  
You shall judge uprightly, (78)  
you shall not show partiality (100?)  
in reprobating for transgressions. (80?)

4. You shall not doubt whether it will be or not.  
(81)

*Barnabas*

(45) You shall not join heartily with haughty people, (65)  
 but shall associate with humble and upright men. (66)  
 You shall accept the experiences that befall you as good, (67)  
 knowing that nothing happens without God. (68)  
 7. You shall not be double-minded (28) or double-tongued (al. talkative). (29)  
 You shall obey your masters with modesty and fear, (102)  
 as a symbol of God. (103)  
 You must not give orders in bitterness (98) to your man or woman slave, who hope in the same God, (97)  
 lest they cease to fear the God who is over you both, (99)  
 for he came not to call men with partiality, (100) but those whom the Spirit had prepared. (101)  
 8. You shall share everything with your neighbor, (90)  
 and shall not call things your own. (91)  
 For if you share what is imperishable, (92) how much more the things that are perishable? (93)  
 You shall not be quick to speak, for the mouth is a deadly snare. (30)  
 As far as you can you shall be pure for your soul's sake.  
 9. Do not be stretching out your hands to take, (82)  
 and closing them when it comes to giving. (83)  
 You shall love as the apple of your eye (71) anyone who speaks the word of the Lord to you. (69)  
 10. Night and day you shall remember the Day of Judgment, (70)  
 and every day you shall seek the company of the saints, (74)  
 either laboring by word of mouth and going out to exhort, and busying yourself in saving souls by the word, or you shall work with your hands (84) for the ransom of your sins. (85)

*Schnudi*

4. My son, do not ask "Who is he? or "Why is he?" (45)  
 for these things lead to idolatry, (47) and do not be an astrologer, for woe, lamentation, fear and terror lodge with such. (46)  
 My son, do not go to the magicians, do not resort to the exorcists, nor their discourses; through such man does not come near to God.  
 5. My son, do not be a liar, (49) for lying leads to theft. (50)  
 My son, do not love money, nor exalt yourself (51) for from these things comes murder. (52)  
 6. My son, do not be a grumbler, (53) for grumbling leads to blasphemy. (54)  
 My son, do not be faint-hearted, and cherish no evil design. (55)  
 7. But be meek, (57) for the meek shall inherit the earth. (58)  
 8. My son, be patient, long-suffering, merciful, of an honest heart, (59) upright in all your doings, (60) always fearful and trembling before the word of God and his commands. (61)  
 9. Do not be proud in your soul, (64) but always be humble.  
 My son, do not cling to the rich, to be near them, (65) but associate with the pious and humble, for through humility the prophet David was often saved. (66)  
 10. Whenever good fortune or ill fortune overtakes you, accept it with thanksgiving, (67) for you know, nothing happens to you without the command of God, your God. (58)  
 iv. 1. My son, night and day remember in your heart (70) the word of God, (99) for the Lord is in the place (193) where his name is remembered. (192) He is worthy of homage, and his praise endures for ever,  
 2. My son, walk always in the way of purity, (74) then you will be strong and mighty, you will enjoy the goodness of their talk, (75) and their profitable discourse.  
 3. My son, do not mix in the quarrels and contentions of brothers (76) but strive to make peace among quarrellers. (77)  
 4. Then judge uprightly, (78) and do not be ashamed to reprove the wicked for his wickedness, and the sinner for his transgression.

*Doctrina*

Noli esse ad accipiendum extendens manum,  
et ad reddendum subtrahens.  
Si habes per manus tuas  
85 redemptionem peccatorum,  
non dubitabis dare,  
nec dans murmuraveris (corr.)  
sciens quia (quis?) sit hujus mercedis bonus  
redditor.  
Non avertes (2d. hd.-tas) te ab egente  
90 communicabis autem omnia cum fratribus  
tuis.  
Nec dices tua esse.  
Si enim [in im]mortalibus socii sumus,  
quanto magis hinc initiantes esse debemus?  
Omnibus enim Dominus dare vult de donis  
suis.  
95 Non tolles manum tuam a filii  
sed a juventute docebis eos timorem domini.  
Servo tuo vel ancillae qui in eundem sperant  
dominum  
in ira tua non imperabis;  
timeat utrumque dominum et te.  
  
100 Non enim venit ut personas invitaret  
sed in quibus spiritum invenit.  
Vos autem servi subjecti dominis vestris  
estote,  
tanquam formae dei cum pudore et tremore.  
Oderis omnem affectationem,  
105 et quod deo non placet non facies.

Custodi ergo, fili, quae audisti,  
neque appones illis contraria neque diminuies.

Non accedas ad orationem cum conscientia  
mala.  
Haec (corr.) est via vitae.  
110 V. Mortis autem via est illi contraria.  
Primum nequam et maledictis plena.  
Mechations.  
homicidia.  
falsa testimonia.  
115 fornicationes.  
desideria mala.  
magicae.

*Didache*

5. Do not be stretching out your hands to take,  
(82)  
and closing them when it comes to giving. (83)  
6. If you have it through your hands (84)  
you shall give a ransom for your sins. (85)  
7. You shall not hesitate to give, (86)  
nor grumble when you give, (87)  
for you shall know who is the good payer of  
wages. (88)  
8. You shall not turn the needy away, (89)  
but you shall share everything with your brother,  
(90)  
and you shall not say it is your own. (91)  
For if you share in what is immortal, (92)  
how much more in mortal things? (93)  
9. You shall not withhold your hand from your  
son or from your daughter, (95)  
but from their youth up you shall teach them the  
fear of God. (96)  
10. You shall not give orders to your man or  
woman slave, (97)  
who hope in the same God, in your bitterness,  
(98)  
lest they cease to fear the God who is over you  
both; (99)  
for he comes not to call men with partiality, (100)  
but those whom the Spirit has prepared. (101)  
11. And you slaves shall obey your masters,  
(102)  
as a symbol of God, with modesty and fear. (103)  
12. You shall hate all hypocrisy, (104)  
and everything that is not pleasing to the Lord.  
(105)  
13. You must not forsake the commandments of  
the Lord,  
but you shall keep the teachings you have re-  
ceived, (106)  
neither adding to them nor taking from them.  
(107)  
14. In church you shall confess your trans-  
gressions,  
and you shall not approach prayer with an evil  
conscience. (108)  
This is the way of life. (109)  
v. 1. But the way of death is this: (110)  
First of all it is wicked and full of cursing; (111)  
murders, (113)  
adulteries, (112)  
lusts, (116)  
fornications, (115)  
thefts, (119)  
idolatries, (120)  
magic arts, (117)

*Barnabas*

11. You shall not hesitate to give (86)  
nor grumble when you give, (87)  
but you shall know who is the good payer of  
wages. (88)  
You shall keep the teachings you have received,  
(106)  
neither adding to them nor taking from them.  
(107)  
You shall absolutely hate evil. (104?)  
You shall judge uprightly. (78)  
12. You shall not cause division, (76)  
but shall bring fighters together and reconcile  
them. (77)

*Schnudi*

5. My son, do not open your hand to take (82)  
and close it when it comes to giving. (83)  
Beware of doing this.  
6. As long as you can, (84)  
give to the poor, (86)  
that your many sins may be outweighed. (85)  
7. But when you give, do not be of a divided  
heart, (87)  
so if you have given, do not be sorry,  
and do not regret it, if you have practised  
charity;  
you must know that it is the true, the just,  
the Lord Jesus, the forgiver of sin, who repays.  
(88)  
8. My son, do not turn your face from the poor,  
(89)  
but give to him according to your ability, (90)  
and *associate with everyone who is afflicted and  
everyone who needs you.*  
And if we share in temporal things with those  
who must be in want, (93)  
we will share with them in the enduring, eternal  
things. (92)  
If we keep these commands we will walk in the  
way of life (109)  
and in the blessed path to eternity, which belongs  
to the only King, the Ruler Jesus Christ, who  
is gracious to those who desire him.

You shall confess your sins.

You shall not approach prayer with an evil  
conscience. (108)  
This is the way of light. (109)  
xx. 1. But the way of the Black One (110)  
is crooked and full of cursing. (111)  
For it is a way of eternal death with punishment,  
(3)  
and in it are the things that destroy men's souls,  
idolatry, (120)  
arrogance, (129)  
exaltation of power, (131)  
hypocrisy, (122)  
duplicity,  
adultery, (112)  
murder, (113)  
robbery, (121)  
pride, (130)  
transgression,  
fraud,  
malice, (124)  
wilfulness, (125)

v. 1. And as concerning the Way of Death, (110)  
he who follows its track and walks in its paths,  
truly, he will die the death of destruction for all  
his evil deeds,  
which are:  
blasphemy,  
murder, (113)

*Doctrina*

medicamenta iniqua.  
furta.

120 vanae superstitiones.  
rapinae.  
affectationes.  
fastidia.  
malitia.

125 petulantia.  
cupiditas.  
impudica loquela.  
zelus.  
audatia.

130 superbia.  
altitudo.  
vanitas.  
non timentes (deum corr.)  
persequentes bonos.

135 odio habentes veritatem.  
amantes mendacium.  
Non scientes mercedem veritatis.  
non applicantes se bonis.  
non habentes judicium justum.

140 pervigilantes non in bono sed in malo.  
quorum longe est mansuetudo.  
et superbia proxima.  
persequentes remuneratores.  
Non miserantes pauperum.

145 non dolentes pro dolente.  
non scientes genitorem suum.  
peremptores filiorum suorum.  
avortuantes.  
avertentes se a bonis operibus.

150 deprimentes laborantem.  
advocationes justorum devitantes.

VI. Abstine te fili ab istis omnibus  
et vide ne quis te ab hac doctrina avocet.  
et si minus extra disciplinam doceberis.

155 haec in consulendo si cottidie feceris  
prope eris vivo deo.  
Quod si non feceris  
longe eris a veritate.  
Haec omnia tibi in animo pone.

160 et non deceperis(-cip- corr.) de spe tua  
sed per haec sancta certamina pervenies ad  
coronam.  
Per dominum ih(esu)m xp(istu)m  
regnantem et dominantem cum deo patre  
et spiritu sancto in saecula saeculorum.  
Amen.

*Didache*

enchantments, (118)  
robberies, (121)  
false witnessings, (114)  
hypocrisies, (122)  
duplicity,  
fraud,  
pride, (123)  
malice, (124)  
wilfulness, (125)  
covetousness, (126)  
foul speech, (127)  
jealousy, (128)  
arrogance, (129)  
exaltation, (131)  
boastfulness, (130)

2. Persecutors of good men, (134)  
hating truth, (135)  
loving falsehood, (136)  
ignorant of the wages of uprightness, (137)  
not adhering to what is good, (138)  
nor to upright judgment, (139)  
lying awake not for what is good but for what is evil, (140)  
from whom gentleness and patience are far away, (141)  
loving vanity,  
seeking reward, (143)  
without pity for the poor, (144)  
not toiling for the oppressed, (145?)  
ignoring their Maker, (146)  
murderers of children, (147)  
corrupters of God's creatures, (148)  
turning away the needy, (149?)  
oppressing the afflicted, (150)  
advocates of the rich,  
unjust judges of the poor, (151?)  
utterly sinful.  
May you be delivered, my children, from all these, (152)

vi. 1. See that no one leads you astray from this way of the Teaching, (153)  
for he teaches you without God. (154)

2. For if you can bear the whole yoke of the Lord, (155)  
you will be perfect; (156)  
but if you cannot, do what you can. (157)

(The rest of Didache, 6: 3-16: 8, seems to show no relation to the Teaching material.)

*Barnabas**Sehnudi*

enchantment, (118)  
magic, (117)  
covetousness, (126)  
disregard of God, (133)

robbery, (121)  
abduction,  
hypocrisy, (122)  
every pernicious act.  
vi. 1. And what we have stated is to serve the end  
that no one go wrong,  
fall into the Way of Death,  
and walk its paths,  
in consequence of his pernicious acts,  
and that what is pernicious shall not prevail,  
even without anyone's misleading one to it. . . .

2. persecutors of good men, (134)  
hating truth, (135)  
loving falsehood, (136)  
ignorant of the wages of uprightness, (137)  
not adhering to what is good, (138)  
not to upright judgment, (139)  
paying no heed to the widow and orphan,  
lying awake not in the fear of God, but for what  
is evil, (140)  
from whom gentleness and patience are far, far  
away; (141)  
loving vanity (142),  
seeking reward, (143)  
without pity for the poor, (144)  
not toiling for the oppressed, (145)  
ready with slander,  
ignoring their Maker, (146)  
murderers of children, (147)  
corrupters of God's creatures, (148)  
turning away the needy, (149?)  
oppressing the afflicted, (150)  
advocates of the rich,  
unjust judges of the poor, (151?)  
utterly sinful.

(Ch. 21 shows no close resemblance to the  
Teaching material.)

## SYRIAN COIN HOARDS AND THE TRIBUTE QUESTION

By J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR.

Union Theological Seminary

Contrary to traditional views, the denarius was not the coin in which Jesus and his companions paid their taxes. His Romanized enemies, the highpriests, Herodians, and certain Prarisees handled it. And therein is the point of his remark, "Render unto Caesar." But for the devout Jewish masses, who did not handle the denarius, his *instruction about the tribute* was, "Render unto God the things that are God's." The silver was rightfully God's. Hence "forbidding to give tribute to Caesar," like the two other accusations in Luke 23:2, has an element of truth.

Syrian coinage thus becomes important for a restudy of Christian origins.

The significance of the denarius in Jesus' retort must be determined by the Augustan coinage policy. A study of that policy shows that *Rome cannot have expected the companions of Jesus to employ the denarius* in paying their taxes. If she had, she would have established mints in the East to produce them. Actually such denarii as chanced to reach Palestine usually had travelled all the way from Lugdunum, capital of Gaul. Soldiers were the chief distributors. And so it was that some forty years after the death of our Lord the legionaries of Vespasian familiarized Eastern peoples with this coin. Prior to that, to many it must have been a curiosity. Not till Trajan and Hadrian did denarii become plentiful. Yet even after that, in the second and third centuries, and in spite of their convenience, they continued to hold a very subordinate position beside the Eastern currencies.

The coin hoards are both evidence for the imperial coin policy and proof as to how it was put into practice. Moreover they show that in the Tribute passage the Gospels have not been guilty of the blunder they make elsewhere in common with the Mishnah, of substituting denarius for the Eastern coins; only with a denarius was Jesus assured of Caesar's "image and superscription."

But caution is needed in judgments based on the hoards. For one thing, we may yet run across new discoveries as startling as those at Dura Europos. Also many finds in the hands of individuals and societies remain unpublished, as I was made painfully aware in the present investigation. Moreover our inferences for Jesus' day are drawn largely from a later period: an evidence of the strength of the Augustan peace.<sup>1</sup> The lack of wear from handling, in the case of most silver coins, shows that they represent money withdrawn from circulation because of its superior value for the ensuring of savings.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Harold Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire . . .*, vol. i (1923), p. lxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Withdrawing coins of superior quality from circulation follows Gresham's law, that of two currencies the inferior one remains in use: cf. Aristophanes, "We prefer to spend vile copper pieces, struck and stamped in the most infamous fashion," while of valued coins we make no use "at all except in our own houses"—*Frogs*, 718-726. Cit. by Sidney P. Noe, "Coin Hoards," *Numismatic Notes*, No. 1, N. Y., 1920. To Mr. Noe and his colleague Mr. S. M. Mosser, as also to the late E. T. Newell, I am indebted for numerous facts here presented.

In spite of such limitations, the known hoards do give us a fair idea of the relative distribution of Eastern and Western coins. Our most satisfactory information comes from Dura Europos. Twenty-one hoards from this single site have been recorded, most of them buried shortly before the fall of the city at the hands of the Parthians in 256 A.D. Adding chance finds, Professor Alfred R. Bellinger informs me that his latest total count is denarii 948, antoniniani 803, and Roman tetradrachms 2380.

Although the antoninianus was a Western coin, supposedly equal to two denarii, about half to two thirds of those found at Dura were minted in the East; the result is that, when Eastern denarii and the tetradrachms are added, *about 82 per cent.* of the coins whose provenance seems to be known were *minted in the East*. In the accompanying table I have used Rome and Antioch as symbols for Western and Eastern mintings, as these were the chief production centers of the coins in question.

Dura Hoards	Denarii		Antoniniani			Tetradrachms
	Rome	Antioch	Rome	Antioch	Doubtful	
I			19	123	141	507
II				1	4	89
III and IV	310	65				32
V	6		1			22
VI						267
VII	54	12	1	1	72	212
VIII and IX	2					1
X			44	86	21	353
XVII			7	41		
XVIII	8					116
XIX	9	1				
XX						27
XXI	18					
Unassigned						45
Totals	407	78	72	251	238	1961
Total Western mintings.					479	
Total Eastern mintings.					2290	
Provenance uncertain.					238	
Total silver coins.					3007	
Probable Eastern mintings about 82 per cent.						

Hoards VIII, IX, XI to XVI are almost exclusively bronze coins. Chief problem of uncertainty is 229 antoniniani of Gordian III (A.D. 238 to 244): A. R. Bellinger reports: "All certainly belong to the same mint and that mint is certainly Antioch"—*Numismatic Notes*, Vol. 49 (1931), p. 25. But the certainty has given way to doubt, and perhaps they are to be assigned to Rome. Even with every effort at accuracy, there are bound to be a few additional errors.

The unassigned tetradrachms represent the difference between the total given to me by Dr. Bellinger and totals represented by available tabulations. Here as elsewhere, under "tetradrachms" are included lesser Attic units. Dura XVII is as yet unpublished. For the others see *Numismatic Notes*, Vol. 49 (N. Y., 1931), Vol. 55 (1932), Vol. 58 (1933), Vol. 69 (1935), and *Excavations at Dura Europos*, Preliminary Reports of Seasons iii to ix.

The House of the Priests furnished three-quarters of all the denarii in the hoards, namely the 375 coins of Hoards III and IV out of a total of 485. The building in question connects with the temple of Atargatis, the name under which the Mother Goddess of the Mediterranean world was worshipped in this area. Its impressive size and spacious rooms speak either for the numbers or wealth of these priests.<sup>3</sup> Absence of antoniniani can be due to an early date of burial, the latest coins being of 218 A.D. whereas Caracalla did not initiate the antoniniani till 215 A.D. As a medium of savings we are struck by the relative absence of tetradrachms, only 32 out of 407 coins. The same absence is true also of the little Hoards XVII and XIX, but these may have belonged to soldiers or officials. The surprising thing is that here the priest of an Oriental goddess should have put aside his savings in a Roman coinage, debased for the most part by a 25 to 40 per cent. of alloy, instead of in tetradrachms which were the traditional "securities" of the East. We assume that it belonged to a single priest, for otherwise it might not have remained intact, and it was funds whose possession the owner did not want known, because the dating of the latest coins suggests it had been set aside thirty years or so previous to the siege.

Several possibilities suggest themselves of how the priest came to have such a large number of denarii. The hoard may represent stolen temple assessments: though we have no proof that Atargatis received an annual denarius comparable to the half-shekel paid to

<sup>3</sup> *Excavations at Dura*, Season iii (1932), p. 25 ff.

Yahweh at Jerusalem, the denarius would be the logical coin in this period because silver was required by the dignity of the Great Mother. That nearly half the denarii of Dura occur in chance finds (approximately 463 as against 485 for the hoards) suggests that in this military outpost and at that time the denarius had become a coin for the market, a fact confirmed by the accounts which Nebuchelus scrawled on the walls of his shop.<sup>4</sup> However we should have expected assessments of this sort to have yielded a relatively greater number of recent mintings. As it is, the distribution takes us back to Nero, and includes 52 from Trajan and even 26 of the undebased Vespasian coins.

Or we may assume that the priest was to all intents a Roman, and therefore just as naturally thought of putting aside his savings in the best denarii he could lay his hands on as a Syrian would put his savings into tetradrachms. As such an explanation meets all the requirements we need hardly go further. However there is also the possibility

<sup>4</sup> "The House of Nebuchelus," by C. B. Welles, in *Exc. Dura*, vol. iv (1933), p. 79 ff. On small transactions, see esp. p. 128, 141 ff. The earliest of these graffiti date from 218 A.D.; most of them from 240 A.D. In spite of the coinage devaluation, the sharp rise in prices which must have set in toward the end of Commodus's reign in certain parts of the empire (Heichelheim, in *Economic History*, Feb. 1935, p. 7 ff.) does not appear to have much affected the Dura area. The crash came a generation after our Dura merchant Nebuchelus, when after driving out the denarius the antoniniani went into a spiral plunge that resulted in the billon of Gallienus (258 A.D.) and the fantastic inflation of Diocletian. See Th. Mommsen, *Geschichte des Römischen Münzens* (Berl. 1860), p. 825 ff.; H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire*, vol. iv (1940), in loc.; Louis C. West, *Numismatic Notes*, vol. 94, p. 121 ff.

that a portion at least of these denarii represent funds received directly from the Roman provincial authorities, either "squeeze" on sacrifices subsidized on behalf of sacrifices to Caesar and Roma, or outright contributions to assure correct guidance for the thinking of the people. The parallel here to what seems to have prevailed in the Temple at Jerusalem is a close one.

If even at a military outpost like Dura and in an age when extensive minting had produced great numbers of denarii and antoniniani the tetradrachm was still the dominant silver coin, how much greater must have been its dominant position in the Palestine of our Lord? The ratio of *one to five* for coins minted in the West and in the East must surely be multiplied several fold. That conclusion is borne out by other hoards.

Of some forty other finds in North Syria and Palestine, those bearing on this period leave little doubt as to the silver medium employed by the masses of the population.

The only hoard exclusively of denarii that I have run across is mentioned in a publication of the *Istituto Italiano di Numismatica*, which speaks of a find somewhere in Syria of 261 denarii, but gives no details of locality.<sup>5</sup> The 22 Vespasian coins are explainable by the strong military occupation; only 11 others come from the first century. Some years ago the late E. T. Newell called my attention to a certain "Shiklar Hoard," buried between 12 and 1 B.C., which contained denarii, but thus far I have been able to find no one who has knowledge of it.

Of mixed hoards, the most important

<sup>5</sup> L. Cesano, art. in *Atti e Memorie*, vol. 5 (1925), p. 57 ff.

seems to be that from Eleuthereopolis, buried shortly after the reign of Hadrian. That date would partially explain the 177 denarii as against 108 tetradrachms.<sup>6</sup> From Antioch, like Dura a great military center, comes a hoard which had been buried about the time of those at Dura. The approximately 350 silver coins, found in a terracotta vase in 1935, consists of tetradrachms plus a few denarii.<sup>7</sup>

The remaining hoards on which I have been able to obtain data are limited to Attic and shekel standards. One of the latest to be published is that from Neapolis in Palestine, consisting of 93 tetradrachms from the periods of Caracalla and Macrinus.<sup>8</sup> One of the earliest was the discovery of a monk named Louis Fattori of Iafa near Nazareth who got a notion one day to dig out some hollows in the rock beneath his church. He unearthed a small earthenware jar which contained 159 third century tetradrachms, the earliest of Caracalla.<sup>9</sup> Another find was at Tyre, consisting of 75 tetradrachms, mostly of the first century A.D.<sup>10</sup> An unknown place in Syria has yielded 22 drachma coins

<sup>6</sup> J. N. Svoronos, in *Journ. Internat. Arch. Num.*, vol. 10 (1907), p. 230-252 (in Greek); a few lesser dr. units included.

<sup>7</sup> S. P. Noe, "Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards," *Num. Notes*, vol. 78, 2nd edition (N. Y., 1937), p. 27.

<sup>8</sup> *Numismatic Studies*, No. 3 (N. Y., 1940), p. 15, *passim*. A peculiarity of this find is that its coins were struck at 18 widely scattered mints. Such characteristics suggest at times that, besides being a means of savings, hoards became the playthings of ancient numismatists.

<sup>9</sup> F. de Sauley, in *Annuaire . . . de Numismatique et d'Archéologie*, vol. iii (1868-70), p. 350 ff.

<sup>10</sup> *Sotheby Sale*, March 26, 1888, p. 24 f.

minted at Caesarea in Cappadocia between 32 to 56 A.D.<sup>11</sup>

Jewish shekels, of which half a dozen hoards have been reported, give us an insight into the zeal with which Jews replaced Caesar's image with symbols in keeping with their religion. The most recent find seems to have come from near Silwan, the ancient Siloah. It contains 3 Jewish shekels and 9 tetradrachms which were unearthed in a fine bronze pyxis. This find settles the much vexed question of a series of coins which formerly had been ascribed to Simon Maccabeus<sup>12</sup> and which now are proved to come from the First Revolt in 66-70 A.D. One shekel is dated 66/7, the first year of the Revolt, and the other two the following year.

Other shekel finds include one from Bittir of 47 coins of the Second Revolt, which were buried with about 300 bronze coins;<sup>13</sup> a hoard of 120 to 500 coins (the exact number uncertain), which are said to have come from Jerusalem and to date from the First and Second Revolts,<sup>14</sup> also, a Jericho hoard

<sup>11</sup> *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. 12 (1932), p. 68 f.

<sup>12</sup> *Palestine Quarterly*, vol. xi, nos. 3 f. (1944), p. 83-85 and plate xix. The tetradrachms are Tyrian, 7 legible ones bearing dates from 13/2 B.C. to 64/5 A.D. Josephus speaks of extensive use of Tyrian money in this period —*Bel. Jud.*, ii. 21. 2 (592). F. W. Madden, *Coins of the Jews* (1903), cf. p. 69, n. 1.

<sup>13</sup> L. Hamburger, *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, vol. 18 (1892), p. 241-348.

<sup>14</sup> "Procès Verbaux" in *Annuaire . . . de Numismatique*, vol. xiv (1890), p. 21 f.

of the Second Revolt which had been superstruck on tetradrachms of Trajan and Hadrian.<sup>15</sup> Another Jericho hoard discovered in 1874 had been the basis of Madden's erroneous conclusions about Maccabean coins. It consists of about 100 shekels. A Jerusalem hoard, from Ophel or St. Stephen, is reported by George Hill: contents are 664 Jewish shekels, 23 Tyrian shekels, and 2 Ptolemaic tetradrachms.<sup>16</sup> Lastly, a shekel and a half-shekel were found in conjunction with Herodian bronzes and coins of the Procurators at the Grotto of St. Peter, Jerusalem.<sup>17</sup>

Thus we seem to have two contemporary cultures, the one Eastern and the other Roman, adherents of each putting their faith in the securities to which they were most accustomed. Though the coin hoards cannot be taken as conclusive evidence of what was handled from day to day, they do seem to indicate when taken in connection with the extensive finds of bronze coinage that the denarius can have had very little place in the lives of Jesus' Jewish contemporaries. Those who regularly handled the denarius had to all intents ceased to be Jews.

<sup>15</sup> Report of a lecture by Froehner, in "Procès Verbaux," *Ann. de Numismatique*, vol. xvi (1892), p. 4.

<sup>16</sup> *Palestine Quarterly*, vol. vi (1938), p. 77 ff. This find should have settled the above question about Maccabean coins if we could be sure that it represented a single find, rather than two separate finds as some believe.

<sup>17</sup> *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1922, p. 133 f.

## EARLY CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

*By* FREDERICK C. GRANT

Union Theological Seminary

The importance of this subject, and the need for accurate knowledge and clear thought upon it, have been strongly emphasized of late by the widespread discussion of an address made by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., at a recent dinner of the Protestant Council of the City of New York. The address was entitled, "The Christian Church: What of its Future?" Mr. Rockefeller, who is an eminent Baptist layman, pleaded for more direct concern by the Church with the actual religious needs of the present, and specifically with the awakened devotion of millions of men and women "who, generally, have not come from the Church, although directly or indirectly all have been more or less influenced by it; who, many of them, have faced death, have lived a life far worse than death, have sacrificed their all," but who have not found in the church as it exists to-day "the recognition, the association, the guidance and the inspiration which they need and have a right to expect." Specifically, he proposed, the church should rise to meet this great challenge and opportunity by laying less emphasis upon creeds, ordinances, rituals, as really "non-essential for admission into the Kingdom of God or His church. A life, not a creed, [ought to] be the test." The terms of admission should be "love for God, as He is revealed in Christ and His living spirit, and the vital translation of that love into a Christlike life." "Cooperation, not competition" should rule in the Church, and "all denominational emphasis [should] be set aside."

The sacraments should be viewed as voluntary forms—not abolished, or even modified, but certainly not made obligatory. They were not made obligatory by Christ, and we cannot imagine that He would "regard the observance or non-observance of them and other ordinances and individual beliefs, or the manner in which they are observed, as of sufficient importance to justify controversy among His followers, and their separation into rival factions."

It is a great pity that this address, which was later printed and circulated by the Protestant Council, has been an occasion for controversy. It might better have been received and discussed in the spirit in which it was composed and delivered. Of course it is not a theological pronouncement—Mr. Rockefeller did not claim to speak as a theological expert, but as a layman, deeply concerned for the future of the church. His background is, naturally, that of a liberal Baptist layman; and in the liberal Baptist tradition, as everyone knows, there is little emphasis upon received views, and a great impatience with "forms." This should be recognized, as well as the eager and devoted Christian spirit of the address. It might then have been pointed out that the vast majority of Christians have always viewed the sacraments as much more important than "voluntary" ordinances would be—indeed, such a view is generally characteristic of historical Christianity; and that a church whose terms of admission were "love for God

... and . . . a Christlike life" might run into very serious difficulties as soon as one group decided that some other group lacked the one or failed to manifest the other. The simple rite of initiation, baptism, practiced since New Testament times, is surely a far more satisfactory "symbol," to say no more, than any other that has been proposed. At the same time, the requirements for Holy Baptism which were set up in the Apostolic or early Post-Apostolic age were far higher than those observed in most churches today, at least here at home (the practice on the mission field is considerably better, on the whole); and Mr. Rockefeller, were he a theologian, and had he cared to do so, might even have appealed to ancient example in making genuine conversion, faith, and loyalty to Christ a prerequisite to admission into the Church. The questions raised by his address cannot be answered as easily as some of his critics have assumed. There is something more to be said for his views, even theologically considered, than has come out in the current discussion of them.

But it is not the purpose of the present paper to defend, or even to appraise, the views of Mr. Rockefeller. Our task is a preliminary one, laid upon us by the whole discussion to date. What is the true theology of Holy Baptism? And what, specifically, are the data of the New Testament and other early Christian writings upon this subject? Part of our difficulty, in the Episcopal Church, is that (a) the New Testament data are differently interpreted by different persons or by different schools of churchmanship; and that (b) too many of us, indeed almost all of us, tend to read-in the details of later doctrine and practice into the New Testament, espe-

cially where parts of the New Testament picture are either obscure or altogether lacking. Theology has been doing this for a long time—not only "Catholic" or Scholastic theology, but also Protestant, and even Liberal Protestant. But today a better method of historical research is gaining ground, and by it we are led to recognize the limitations of our knowledge, and to refuse to supply from later systems what is lacking in the fragmentary records of the earliest age of the Church's doctrine and practice. The student of today must make his own, and devoutly repeat again and again, that noble class-room prayer of Henry Sylvester Nash: "Give us, O God, the scholar's conscience, that we may never, seeking for effect, go outside our knowledge; gladden us with the saint's vision of thy blessed face, so giving rest to our restless hearts; and crown thy gifts with the prophet's passion for righteousness and truth; through our Teacher and our Guide, Jesus Christ. Amen." We do not anticipate that sound research will contradict, at any essential point, the presuppositions of Catholic faith or practice, since there is a real continuity, in the midst of development, in Christian doctrine and usage; but our starting point is the New Testament, not mediaeval Scholasticism, or the Council of Trent, or the doctrinal Confessions of the Reformation period; and the method which we are now undertaking to follow is the historical, not the logical or systematic.

I. The fullest sources of information about early Christian baptism are not to be found in the New Testament, but in Justin Martyr, the *Didachê*, and Tertullian. Even these sources are not as

complete as those from succeeding centuries. But they throw light backwards upon the New Testament era: Justin and the *Didachē* from about 150 A.D. (I accept Dr. Muilenburg's demonstration of this date for the *Didachē*), and Tertullian from the close of the second century. Not that we can assume that either in practice or doctrine their statements always hold good for the earliest days; but these writings—not much later than those of the New Testament, and two of them (Justin and the *Didachē*) perhaps contemporary with the latest book of the New Testament, II Peter—these writings show the direction in which the main body of Christian thought and observance was moving, and so we can trace a line backwards from them to the point of origin. The various statements of the New Testament can then be examined with reference to this hypothetical line of development, somewhat as latitude and longitude are given with reference to a hypothetical meridian and parallel.

Let us read the passages in question. Justin Martyr writes in his (*First*) *Apology*, ch. 61: "I will also explain the way in which we dedicated ourselves to God when we had been made new through Christ, lest my omission should be looked upon as prejudicial. As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and entreat God with fasting for the remission of their former sins, we praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us where there is water, and they are regenerated in the same manner in which we ourselves were regenerated. For in the name of God, the Father and Ruler of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus

Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water."

At the end of the chapter Justin adds: "In the water is pronounced over him who chooses to be born again, and has repented of his sins, the name of God the Father and Ruler of the universe, he who leads to the laver the person that is to be washed calling Him [sc. God] by this name alone. For no one can utter the name of the ineffable God, and if anyone dares [even] to say that He has a name, he is raving with incurable madness. But this washing is called Illumination (Gr. *φωτισμός*), because those who learn these things are illuminated in their understandings. And in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who through the prophets foretold all things about Jesus, the one who is illuminated is washed."

In ch. 14:1 of the *Dialogue with Trypho* Justin discusses the Jewish rites of ablution and insists that Christian baptism alone can purify those who have repented of their sins. "This," he says, "is the water of life. But the cisterns which you have dug for yourselves are broken and useless to you. For what is the value of that baptism which merely cleanses the flesh and the body? Baptize the soul from wrath, from envy, and from hatred; and lo! the body is pure."

In ch. 43:2 of the same dialogue Justin remarks that "we who have approached God through Jesus Christ have received a circumcision, not carnal but spiritual, which Enoch and those like him observed."

In the *Didachē*, coming from about the same time, we read (ch. 7): "Now concerning baptism, baptize as follows:

having spoken beforehand all these things [ehh. 1-6?], baptize in [or into] the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in living [i.e. running] water. But if you do not have living water, baptize in other water; and if you cannot in cold, then in warm. And if you have neither, then pour water upon the head thrice, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Now before the baptism, let the one who is baptizing and the one who is being baptized fast, and any others who can; and bid the one who is being baptized to fast for one or two days before."

Justin wrote in Rome, but was familiar with the doctrine and practice of Ephesus—and even Palestine (Samaria). The *Didachē* reflects conditions in Syria—though some have argued for Egypt. Its conservative and even primitive outlook is patent to everyone, save for a few scholars who cannot get a predilection for Montanism out of their minds. We turn now to Tertullian, who represents North Africa, and whose views are no doubt those that were held in that great Christian Church, in spite of the fact that he was now a Montanist and was engaged in writing his huge work *Against Marcion* (Harnack, *Chronol.* II, 284). His statements, in the treatise *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, have been summed up accurately by F. C. Conybeare as follows (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. III, p. 364):

1. The flesh is washed, that the soul may be freed from stain.
2. The flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated.
3. The flesh is sealed (i.e. signed with the cross), that the soul also may be protected.

4. The flesh is overshadowed with imposition of hands, that the soul also may be illuminated by the Spirit.

5. The flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul also may be filled and sated with God.

6. He also mentions elsewhere that the neophytes, after baptism, were given a draught of milk and honey. (The candidate for baptism, we further learn from his tract *On Baptism*, prepared himself by prayer, fasting and keeping of vigils.)

7. Before stepping into the font, which both sexes did quite naked, the neophytes had to renounce the devil, his pomps and angels.

8. Baptism was usually administered at Easter and in the season of Pentecost which ensued, and by the bishop or by priests and deacons commissioned by him. These features are recognizable in the later baptismal rites of both East and West, in all the orthodox churches, while some even of the heretical bodies observed them—e.g. the Marcionites.

II. When we work back, now, through the New Testament data to the *origins* of Christian baptism, it appears that it is everywhere looked upon as the normal rite of initiation into the Christian Church. This statement is so true that it is confirmed even indirectly in more than one New Testament writing. (a) If St. Paul, speaking personally, could insist that "Christ did not send [him] to baptize but to preach"; if he could even "thank God that [he] had not baptized any" of the Corinthians, lest they should claim that they had been baptized "into" him, and were thus entitled to be his sectaries; and if he had thought so little about the matter that he could not even remember clearly

whether he had baptized the household of Stephanas and one or two others (I Cor. 1:14-17), as an exception to his sweeping statement—then it must be obvious that Paul did not originate the rite, perhaps under the influence of Mithraism (!) as some have maintained. If "sacramentalism" had been a Pauline innovation, we may be sure that he would have been far more emphatic about it. Baptism, in other words, was among the things Paul had "received" from those who were in Christ before him.

(b) The Gospel of St. John, produced late in the first century or early in the second, represents the practice of baptism as going back to Jesus and the Apostles, even though the qualification is added, "Though Jesus himself did not baptize, but [only] his disciples did" (John 4:2). The beginnings of Christian baptism went back to so *early* a time, that the Christian movement and that of John the Baptist could be represented as rivals (4:1).

Moreover, (c) the late Gospel of St. Matthew represents Holy Baptism as included in the Great Commission of the risen Lord to His disciples on a mountain in Galilee: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations [this means, 'make all the nations disciples'], baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you all the days until the consummation of the age" (Matt. 28:19-20). It has been argued that the words, "baptizing them into the name of [the Blessed Trinity]," are a later addition to the passage: they were omitted by Eusebius, and perhaps by others (Eusebius read, "in my name,"

which cannot be original); furthermore the thought of the passage moves more easily, if we omit the clause, from "make disciples" to "teaching them"; nevertheless, their primitive, and even their Jewish or Jewish Christian, connotations have been shown by no less a scholar than the late George Foot Moore (*Judaism*, Vol. I, p. 188), and they must be early. I am prepared to recognize them as belonging in the original text of Matthew, though I grant they may be an addition to the saying which had been made not long before Matthew wrote his Gospel. If we recognize that this Gospel of St. Matthew as a whole is late, as many scholars now view it, the difficulty with the clause tends to disappear. But let us note this fact: the clear tendency or inclination of the author was to ascribe the institution of baptism to Jesus himself, since it was so old and so universal a practice in the Church; yet he does not introduce it into the earthly ministry of the Lord, any more than John does (save by authorization and example). He is too honest for that—and so he falls back upon the period following the Resurrection, as John likewise does for the institution of the Apostolate (ch. 21; see B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, 1933), and as Luke does for the inculcation of "the things concerning the Kingdom of God" (by Kingdom of God he apparently understands the Church), the baptism with the Spirit, and the Apostolate (Acts 1:1-8). Later writers did the same, assigning the founding of the Church, the institution of the ministry and sacraments, the full round of Christian doctrine, and even esoteric lore, apocalyptic and other, to the period before the Ascension, either "the great 40 days" or some

longer period, as in certain second century writings. Matthew *would* have dated the institution of baptism during Jesus' ministry in Galilee or Jerusalem, had there been sufficient evidence for it. He does not, but instead he assigns it to the earliest period in the history of the Apostolic Church.

And that is where we shall have to leave it too, unless we are prepared to give up the consistent New Testament belief that the Risen Lord, exalted and glorified, remained in close touch with His Church, and through the Holy Spirit continued to guide it "into all truth." In that case, we shall be tempted to assume that unless it can be proved that Jesus instituted the sacrament during the days before His Passion, it has no real claim to authorization by Him. But such a skeptical view has no warrant in the New Testament—it is pure modern "historicism" (*Historismus*), of a most flagrant kind! The early Church was a Spirit-filled, Spirit-guided group of men and women, for whom the earthly life of Jesus was only the preliminary to his mighty deeds as the Risen Lord, and to that mightiest deed of all, his future coming "in power and great glory" as the Judge of all mankind and the final Inaugurator of the Kingdom of God upon a transformed earth. That he really could—and did— institute sacraments, ministry, give rules, decide cases, and lay commands upon his Church *after* his Resurrection was assumed everywhere in the Apostolic age, by Paul no less than by the Jerusalem Apostles, or by the "prophets and teachers" in the scattered Christian communities in Palestine, or by the seer of the Apocalypse on lonely Patmos.

I have not mentioned the passage in the last chapter of St. Mark (16:16), as the final verses of Mark (16:9-20) are now generally recognized to be spurious, and only one of several attempts to "complete" that Gospel. They probably come from the middle of the second century, and depend upon the data of the other Gospels and even of the Book of Acts. At most, it is assumed that baptism (together with Christian belief) is the *sine qua non* of salvation—which is of course the usual view of the early church.

III. The origin of Christian baptism goes back, accordingly, to the earliest Christian communities in Palestine. This is the point to which all the various accounts of doctrine and practice, in the New Testament and in the other early Christian writings, can be traced. Baptism did not originate in the early Gentile churches, as some have argued, though certain of its accompanying ceremonies came in time to be added from pagan rather than from Jewish sources—e.g. trine immersion, which was the usual practice among Greeks and Romans; or the feeding of the newly baptized with milk and a bit of honey, as a new-born babe would be fed, or as the baptized initiates in the mysteries of Mithra were fed a morsel of honey. But these and many other additions were made much later on, as the Gentile Church took over the best parts of its legacy from pagan religion and consecrated some of them to Christian uses. The *origin* of baptism is much earlier, and coeval with the Christian movement. Hence you must look to Jewish analogies, and to a normal Jewish or Jewish Christian interpretation of its *terminology*, for the earliest meaning

of the rite—i.e. for its original “theology.”

A baptism was required of all proselytes to Judaism. It signified (presumably) the washing away of the contaminating defilement of idolatry.<sup>1</sup> It took place in connection with circumcision, i.e. immediately following that rite, for male converts, and in lieu of that rite, for women. The rule in Jewish casuistry (b. Yeb. 78a) that the child of a woman proselyte need not be baptized at its birth, in case the mother’s baptism took place before the child was born—that rule points clearly to the significance of baptism as the washing away of heathen defilement.<sup>2</sup> Her child would thus be born a Jew, undefiled by idolatry. Presumably St. Paul held a similar view with regard to Christian children (I Cor. 7:14). And presumably the earliest Christian converts from paganism underwent a similar washing, which was necessary, as a rule, before the reception of the Spirit, whether with or without the Apostolic laying on of hands. The strange case in Acts 10:44–48, where the gift of the Spirit takes place before baptism, amazes the Jewish Christians, and is immediately “regularized” by Peter’s direction that baptism is to be administered to the household of Cornelius.

But it is not only the Jewish practice of baptizing proselytes that helps us to understand the origin of the Christian rite. According to the New Testament, “the baptism of John” marked the beginning of the Christian movement, and

although the author of Acts is not very clear as to the exact status of John’s followers (Apollos could teach “accurately the things concerning Jesus,” though “knowing only the baptism of John,” 18:25—presumably he understood this to mean John’s proclamation of the coming of Jesus; see 19:4), it is everywhere assumed that some at any rate of John’s followers became Christians; others, as we gather from John ch. 1, and from other passages, were “continuing Baptists,” so to speak, and rivalled the Church in its propaganda, at least among the Jews. The remarkable thing about the baptism of John was that he required even of born Jews, upon repentance, the same “washing” that Judaism required of proselytes from heathenism. Josephus (Antiq. 18. 5. 2) describes John’s baptism in terms designed to win approval from intelligent, religious-minded Romans: it is a lustration of the body *after* the soul has been cleansed by the putting away of sin. That may or may not be an accurate explanation; we suspect that John the Baptist was a good deal more Jewish than Josephus represents. On the other hand, the account in Mark 1:4 has been suspected of Christian reformulation: “John the Baptizer appeared in the wilderness and preached a baptism of repentance unto remission of sins.” The phrase, “unto remission of sins” (*εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν*) may be a Christian tag, readily suggested by “repentance”; it is retained by Luke in his Gospel but omitted in the Book of Acts (twice, 13:24 and 19:4). The chief difficulty is with the word “remission” (*ἀφεσις*); the rest sounds Jewish enough. Presumably John’s great mission of repentance and baptism was based upon the prophetic anticipation

<sup>1</sup> But see G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, 332. See also J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme Palestinien*, I, 30; F. Weber, *System der altsynagog. pal. Theologie*, § 19 (p. 75).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. Jeremias, *Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt?* 1938.

of such a national washing or purification at or before the coming of the Messianic era. Whether or not it can be called sacramental is not certain; some Christian interpreters have held that it was, being no different in this respect from Christian baptism—e.g. Tertullian, who wrote (*De Bapt.* 4), “we cannot distinguish between those whom John baptized (*tinxit*) in the Jordan and those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber.” But this was scarcely the later view, which has been that John’s baptism was non-sacramental. Yet if it actually *conveyed* remission of sins, it must have been sacramental, in some sense. But I suppose the greater probability is that John’s baptism symbolized—and, like all ancient rites, in all ancient religions, somehow *effected* what it symbolized, viz.—the *washing away* of sin, rather than its forgiveness or “remission.” As a matter of fact, the Greek word *ἀφεοις* may mean exactly that, just as it stands, without any change.<sup>3</sup>

John’s baptism was presumably self-administered, like other Jewish baptisms (see C. R. Bowen, *Studies in the New Testament*); it was an immersion, no doubt, and Tertullian’s *tinxit* is a most vivid word for it—it is the word for “dipping” a garment in dye to give it a new color. Apparently early Christian baptism was by immersion, as a rule, and hence self-administered: i.e. the convert entered the water and submerged himself in it (cf. *Acts* 22:16 *βάπτισαι*). St. Paul’s whole analogy of baptism and burial with Christ, emergence and resurrection with Christ, presupposes this form of the rite; while the rule in the *Didachē* proposes pouring

<sup>3</sup> See Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 98 ff.; Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, col. 208, 209 f.

only in case baptism “in living [i.e. running] water” is impossible. Justin’s language presupposes the same procedure: the candidate is “brought by us where there is water,” or is “led to the laver, to be washed.” The office of the baptizer is to pronounce the words; in later terminology, he provides the “form.” But he is also to instruct the candidate about the significance of the step he is taking: in the *Didachē*, the substance of this instruction is given in the opening chapters; it is the teaching about the Two Ways, one of life and the other of death—a whole collection of traditional moral instruction, perhaps originally Jewish. This practice of giving instruction to the candidate for baptism must also have been very early, for in the Jewish baptism of proselytes an instruction in the Law was given the new adherent to Judaism. Such a writing as Clement of Alexandria’s *Exhortation to the Newly Baptized* (easily accessible in the Loeb Library)—not to mention I Peter, in the New Testament—and the later *traditio* and *redditio* of the Creed, are also undoubtedly related to this early custom.

Now the question arises, Was baptism viewed as a sacrament of *regeneration*, from the beginning? There is no question that this doctrine is found in the New Testament. Titus 3:5 refers to “the washing of regeneration”; while the whole Pauline metaphor of rebirth, of dying and rising with Christ, of the “raising up” of the new man in Christ, and the explicit statement in John 3:5 (at least as the text now stands), show that the idea was present from an early date—Paul’s letters contain of course the earliest of these references. But it is doubtful if the idea can go all the way

back to the early Jewish Church. In spite of the late reference in the *Talmud* to the proselyte as a new-born babe (which is only a homiletical figure of speech; Judaism did not hold the doctrine of rebirth,<sup>4</sup> as the whole narrative in John ch. 3 correctly implies), and in spite of able arguments in support of the idea, e.g. those of the late Frank Gavin, in his useful book, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* (1928), there is little evidence for the doctrine in our earliest sources. Here we see the great contribution of Paul, or of the Gentile Church before and during his time, to the interpretation of the meaning of the rite. Our New Testament sources for this doctrine all show the influence of Pauline ideas in other areas; and it may be thought that this great metaphor—it is one of his five or six favorite metaphors for salvation (see Deissmann, *Paul*, ch. 7)—brought out the meaning of the experience of baptism in even fuller measure than any of his other figures do. For the Christian salvation, the new life in Christ, was something *more* than release from sin, or acquittal at court, or the washing of the body and the simultaneous cleansing of the soul, or the redemption and manumission of a slave, or the adoption of a son by a father, or any other metaphor, could make clear. It was an experience of profound, inner transformation: "If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation!" As on the first day of the creation of the world, when God said, "Let there be light," so now the light of the glory of God seen in the face of Christ streams into the soul of the newly made Christian—and there is no better metaphor

to describe it than the one current in many a contemporary Hellenistic cult: the Christian is *reborn*, is literally, in mind and soul, a new person. The old personality has passed away, and a new mind, a new will, a new purpose, a new love, a new goal in life—in short, "the mind of Christ"—is now his, and is being formed in him. This profound, transforming, "evangelical" experience lies at the very heart of the doctrine, which first emerged as a metaphor, and then eventually got fixed at the very center of all Christian theology of salvation: it lies at the center of the theology of baptism, for orthodox Christianity, and at the heart of the doctrine of salvation even for those sects that make little of what they call "outward ordinances."

Paul's theology, as we now see somewhat more clearly than our fathers did, is a theology of *experience*. At heart he is a mystic—a very strange person to have grown up in Judaism, and above all as a Pharisee; but he was a Diaspora Jew, and his religious thought had other sources in addition to those of normal Judaism. But it is a theology which also rests upon tradition, as well as experience, specifically upon the early Christian tradition; and it turns for support and for elucidation to the Old Testament, i.e. to sacred scripture, and also to reason, imagination, poetry, analogy, rhetoric—to whatever will convey to some extent the overwhelming, transcendent significance of the new life in Christ. We cannot complain that Paul did not live in the fifth century, or the fifteenth, or the twentieth; nor can we compel him to speak a later language than his own. What we see in Paul is theology in the making, and these are its sources: experience, tradition, scrip-

<sup>4</sup> See W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*, p. 91.

ture, and reason. Perhaps these do not belong all on the same level—reason, e.g., is really the activity that produces a theology, whatever its sources, for “theology” is only rational thought applied to the data of experience and tradition or scripture; I only mean that, in addition to the data first mentioned, Paul is prepared to use any analogy, any figure, any thought or fancy, from whatever source, that can make somewhat clearer the great fact of salvation, the new life in Christ, the assurance of “justification,” of acquittal, or release, and the sense of fresh power, of a new beginning, of a fresh creation at the hand of God, which belongs to the disciple of Christ.

IV. I should say, then, if I may summarize as brief a paper as this, that the order of development in the New Testament theology of Holy Baptism, was somewhat as follows:

1. Many early converts (especially in Palestine) had already received the baptism of John. To them, baptism meant the symbolic—but real—washing away (or “putting away”) of their sins.

2. Many (especially in the pagan world) had already been baptized as proselytes to Judaism. To them, it meant the removal of defilement contracted through contact with idolatry.

3. The origin of the distinctively *Christian* practice goes back to the earliest apostolic days—naturally without an explicitly formulated theology, for there was no such thing as theology, indeed no need was felt for one, in the Jewish or Jewish Christian world at that time.

4. The original meaning of the rite was a *washing away of sins*, following repentance, as in John’s baptism, and

as in the case of Jewish proselyte baptism—though it could not long remain at this level. The whole significance of *Christian* baptism, as distinct from others, was that it was *εἰς ὄντα Χριστὸν*, into the name of Christ: that is, it made a man a Christian, not a Jew, or a follower of John; and this meant that he became a disciple of Christ, followed his teaching, looked forward to his coming as the glorified Messiah, spread his gospel, and submitted his whole way of life to “the commandments and ordinances of the Lord.” This was no doubt the point at which baptism became the *sacrament of initiation* into the Church, the New Israel, and hence was required of all—Jews as well as Gentiles, followers of John, and all others. From now on, baptism was the normal mode of admission into the Christian body, and it is so represented in the Book of Acts and in the Gospel of John and elsewhere in the New Testament.

5. Paul’s great contribution was the opening up of profounder depths of meaning in the Christian experience of salvation. As Johannes Weiss held, his theology was “a theology of conversion and of mission,” and his great doctrine of the Church as Christ’s Body, and likewise his description of salvation in terms of rebirth, led directly to the later Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It was Paul, no doubt, or the Gentile Christianity associated with him, which made of baptism the *sacrament of regeneration*, i.e. of a new life. At any rate, this is a third stage in the development of the doctrine of Holy Baptism in the New Testament, and seems to be derived from Gentile Christianity, probably from Paul.

6. At the same time, and later, in

"common Gentile Christianity" outside the Pauline sphere—and to some extent even within it—the older language continued in use. Justin wrote, a century after Paul, "I will relate how we dedicated ourselves to God *when we had been made* new through Christ." The undertaking to live the Christian life, morally and devotionally, comes first—as it does in later practice, when people were urged to defer baptism until they had first proved their ability to live without grave sin, and when sponsors were required to attest the previous conduct of the candidate. All this looks as if the Church generally did not take the Pauline doctrine in full earnest, and as if the doctrine proved somewhat too heroic or too confident for the majority of Christians.

7. Finally, the whole New Testament, and following it the earliest non-canonical Christian literature, stresses the *ethical* presuppositions of the rite. Not only must the candidate for baptism renounce his sins, and prove himself a disciple of the Christian way, but after his baptism he must hold most loyally and tenaciously to his Christian profession. There was no second baptism, and, for many teachers and groups of Christians, no "second chance" of any kind, if a man fell away into sin or apostasy or gave way under the stress of persecution (Heb. 10: 26-39). Here the ethical standard and the test of true faith go hand in hand—and the rigidity of the requirement (as Paul Wernle pointed out long ago in his book, *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus*, 1897) is largely owing to the refusal of Paul to recognize—at least in theory—the possibility of post-baptismal sin. But the Church had to recognize it, practically, and so devised a system of

penitence, i.e. of confession, penance, and restoration, which would meet this situation. And it did so—contrary to the popular modern assumption—without lowering the "heroic" ethics of St. Paul, or of the New Testament in general, or of Jesus himself as set forth in the gospel.

Here is a major factor which Mr. Rockefeller's paper, and the current discussion of it throughout the Church, might well lead us to consider with far more seriousness than has been common, except on the Mission field, for lo, these many years. It is not Mr. Rockefeller who has minimized the importance of Holy Baptism—he has merely drawn the inference that many others have drawn, while his main plea is for a higher and more Christian view of the ethical and spiritual requirements for admission to the Church. Those who have minimized the importance of Baptism, and the ethical and spiritual requirements of Christian discipleship, are—compared with early Catholic Christianity—the modern churches, all of them, from Rome on one extreme to the most Liberal of Protestants on the other. A Christian of the New Testament period, or of the age of the martyrs, or even of the fourth or fifth century, would not know what to make of us—baptizing people perfunctorily and without adequate preparation, without intensive instruction and preliminary testing; certainly this is too commonly the practice here at home—though, as I say, I believe a higher standard prevails in most of the foreign missionary field. And this is something that very seriously needs to be discussed, and discussed much more fully than some of the other issues which have been the center of debate since Mr. Rockefeller's address was published.

## PERSONAL AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF BAPTISM

By REUEL L. HOWE

Virginia Theological Seminary

### I. INTRODUCTION

Attempts to explain the present practice of infant baptism by ancient theology, concerned as it was with the baptism of adults, tend to create magical conceptions of the sacrament. The original belief about baptism was that it was an instrument by which the old life of sin was left behind, and a new life was begun; the old egocentric self died and was buried in Christ's death, and a new theocentric self was born. The necessary condition for baptism was, of course, faith in Christ. There was a sharp line between the old life and the new, marked by baptismal washing. Our present situation, in which the baptism of infants is more common, makes the earlier concept unreal since there is no old life or egocentricity to die, and conscious faith in Christ is not possible. The instrumental<sup>1</sup> aspect of baptism is, therefore, not sufficient to justify the baptism of infants. Many lay people have come to confine the meaning and significance of baptism to the service itself. They are of the opinion that when the service is ended the work of baptism is complete. There is evidence that parents sometimes hide carelessness of or indifference to their educational, emotional and religious responsibilities for their children behind the fact that they have been baptised and all obliga-

tions have, therefore, been met. Furthermore, the attitude toward the rite is more cultural than religious—it is the thing to do. Nor is it uncommon for the meaning of baptism to be confined to the formal act of giving the child a name. Since this functional aspect of the sacrament, in a time when infant baptism is more common, does not convey its whole meaning, and, in fact, endangers its meaning in the understanding of many people, we must ask ourselves, What other significance is there that can be made the basis of a much needed reform in its administration?

The answer is found in the fact that baptism from the earliest times has symbolized much more than what at the moment it effects. It symbolizes the end of which the rite itself marks the beginning, namely, the process of growth of the individual from the moment that he emerges from the womb of the font until he finishes his life course as, we hope, a mature child of God. The implications of baptism, therefore, embrace the whole life of the individual and anticipate all that the words of the rite promise: cleansing from sin, rebirth into new creaturehood, conscious and mature<sup>\*</sup> membership in God's family. But the sacrament of itself will not accomplish this result. The fellowship, the body of the believers who have received this same baptism, must assume responsibility for the realization, in the developing life of the newly received

<sup>1</sup> The writer is indebted to the late Canon Quick for the distinction between the "instrumental" and "symbolical" significance of Baptism. See O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*, ch. VIII.

person, of the full meaning of baptism. To this responsibility of the fellowship the symbolic significance of the sacrament points; and it is with this responsibility that the present article is concerned. It will attempt to show how the evangelical implications of baptism may be realized in the nurture of mature Christian individuals and in a society of Christian fellowship in faithful response to the command: "Go teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."<sup>2</sup>

## II. HUMAN PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES IN RELATION TO BAPTISM

### A. EGOCENTRICITY

Some aspects of the human situation which are the concern of the sacrament will be examined in order to make clear some of its personal and social implications.

One of the central problems in human experience is the problem of our egocentric patterns of living. A person's attitudes toward and ideas about himself, his interests, motives, his fears and his hates constitute the point of reference for all his relationships and values. Fritz Kunkel<sup>3</sup> has pointed out that this egocentric self is different from the real and potential self of the person. The real self is buried beneath and is the prisoner of the rigid encrustations, structures, and decrees of the ego-centered self which is the product of family and other social influences. A student, for example, finds it almost impossible to do assigned reading, yet he does thoughtfully and retentively a great

amount of voluntary reading. He shows that he is capable of sustained, purposeful and creative effort, but is not able to apply it to assigned activity because his ego, conditioned by past experience, resents authority and is threatened by authoritative direction. Thus the tyranny of the ego oppresses the full creative potentialities of the real person, which are never completely realized. It jealously guards the domain of personality and strenuously resists any relationship which endangers its reign. When friendship with another person beckons, there is at first a spontaneous response, but as time goes on, the ego, because of its centricity, will not, cannot, enter into a creative, give-and-take relationship. Egocentric persons, not finding it more blessed to give than to receive, make self-centered demands of others. This condition, likewise, is a major source of marital disharmony and disruption because one partner, using the other, reduces him from the status of a person to that of a thing. So it is that egocentricity impoverishes human fellowship.

When the ego is confronted by Christ and His claim of supremacy a mighty conflict ensues. There is that within us which responds and wants to respond. This is the real self which recognizes its Maker and Redeemer. But there is also that in us—the ego—which will have none of Him, because to accept Him would mean the abdication of its reign over the personality. The ego's methods of defense vary, but there are two of major importance. The first method is one of open resistance. A rich man came running to Jesus and asked Him, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Here is the spontaneous response of the real

<sup>2</sup> Matt. 28: 19.

<sup>3</sup> In *Search of Maturity*, Scribners, 1944.

self seeking uninhibitingly the complete fulfilment of its eternal destiny. When Jesus refers him to the commandments as being the first requirements on the way, the young man says, "Master, all these have I observed from my youth." Is it too much to read into these words evidences of pride and defensiveness which are always expressions of egocentricity? Certainly there was some kind of defect, because Jesus says, "One thing thou lackest." Then comes the final test of the young man's response, "Go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me." And the young man was sad at that saying, and went away grieved. The ego will not surrender, and the person who is constituted of more than ego, but is ruled by it, goes away sorrowfully. This is the common tragedy of egocentricity.

The other method of ego-defense is a compromise which is characterized by the appropriation of the challenging values to its own purposes. In this strategy the ego does not surrender to Christ, it uses Him. The minister who uses the church and his office for self-advancement is an example of this method of ego-control. Faith in our works or in our own strategems for bringing in the Kingdom of God is another. The ego-faith that man is good enough to achieve union with God produces, according to Brunner, two results: "Either you deceive yourself about yourself, forgetting that you are a sinful man, confusing the demands of God with the standards of middle-class (ego-centered) integrity and thus satisfying yourself; or you really take God's will seriously and fall into despair when

you see that you can never be just before that will."<sup>4</sup>

The conclusion of this matter is that ego-activity creates conflict within the person and isolates him from outside relationships. The ego is the enemy of both the individual and society. It breeds divisions, quarrels and wars, and all the works of the flesh. It demands both worship and service so that it is also the enemy of God.

The beginnings of egocentricity occur during infancy, its development takes place during childhood. Our children appear on earth, as far as we can see, in a state of actual innocence, neither good nor bad in themselves, and equally ready to develop good and bad, wholesome and unwholesome qualities according to the circumstances. They are born, not into isolation, but into relationships which immediately begin to influence them for good or ill. During the earliest period of their lives, children are so completely a part of the group that they reflect like mirrors the emotional situation of their environment. Their potential egocentricity is nurtured by and flourishes under the egocentric influences of the home and culture into which they are born; the sicknesses and evils of one generation are in this way passed on to the next.

It is this human nature which the church believes is reborn by the grace of baptism acting continuously. If this means anything, it must mean that there is power in the Christian faith and relationship to prevent the reign of destructive egocentricity, or, if it begins to rule, to break its power. The power of the Christian Gospel is in part dependent upon human cooperation—its

<sup>4</sup> Emil Brunner, *Our Faith*, Scribners, 1936, p. 96 (parenthesis mine).

understanding and skill in appropriating and using the natural and revealed resources that God has given. Scientific researches have made known to us what are some of the primary needs of children. A correlation of our religious and scientific insights will help us to a more effective administration of baptism and open to us some of its personal and special implications.

#### B. SOME PRIMARY HUMAN NEEDS

The child has three fundamental needs that must be fulfilled if he is to mature adequately. (1) He must be accepted as an individual in his own right; (2) he must have wholesome experiences of being loved and of loving; and (3) he needs the support of a consistent and understanding discipline. The personal and social implications of baptism will be discussed in relation to these three needs of the child.

(1) *Acceptance.* A child should be given every opportunity to develop his own unique character and find his individual destiny, and to these ends be protected from all distortions and from all unnecessary deprivations and exploitations by adults. This inalienable right of every child stems from God's creative purposes. One of the evidences of the sin of our culture is that it seeks to regiment life and make it conform to conventional patterns. Our culture, Christian though it may claim to be, does not have a vocation for the nurture of persons. Economic or other utilitarian functions of persons are more important than the persons themselves. A so-called Christian mother cannot be bothered with basing her child's schedule on his particular organic rhythms because she has other more important things to do. She makes the child con-

form to an arbitrary schedule based on chronological time and creates a natural rebellion in the two weeks old child that is the first step in the development of egocentric patterns of living. The first experience of such a child is rejection, the effect of which may be permanent distortion of his spirit. In this as in all aspects of his development the child needs to be accepted as an individual.

In and through the rite of baptism the Christian family in the Name of God symbolically affirms this principle, and accepts the child in all of his individuality. At the moment of baptism the minister says, "Name this child." The name given at this time is the Christian name. The Christian name identifies the individual as God's own child, and, furthermore, distinguishes a particular child from every other child of God. It is both a name of individuality and of relationship. When we receive an individual into the family of God, we do not do so in order that we may make him conform to patterns of human convention; rather, we receive him in order that out of the influences of the fellowship, he may grow into the fulness of spiritual stature for which God created him, and of which his Christian name should always be a sacred symbol—a symbol not only to the individual who bears the name but to the fellowship into which he is received and which should assume responsibility for him. A responsibility of such proportions and far-reaching consequences cannot be fulfilled at the time of the rite. If the symbolical significance of the sacrament is to mean anything, the fellowship must seek diligently to make clear to every person who is to have control of and influence over the child the inner meaning of

baptism on this point of individuality and free personhood. It means that members of the family of God must teach parents the true Christian meaning of parenthood in terms of their particular relationships with children and of their family situations; it means encouraging pediatricians in their present emphasis on this point and helping them to see that it is not only good pediatrics but also good Christianity; it means helping teachers to see in their vocation an opportunity to nurture redeemed and abundant character; and it means that no minister of this sacrament should ever administer it without first preparing at least the parents and godparents for their respective Christian responsibilities in relation to the child.

The particular responsibilities of the family, and here the family is regarded as the principal trustee of the grace of baptism during the early years of the child's life, need more detailed mention. Acceptance of a new individual is not an easy matter. Perhaps the new child was not wanted in the first place, or a boy rather than a girl was wanted. Or the child may have been wanted from unwholesome motives and for egocentric purposes: as a love-object compensating for a lack of love between the parents, as a means for providing opportunity for the exercise of egocentric authority on the part of the parents, or as a means for one parent to exercise control over the other. Again, the mere presence of the child inevitably causes dislocations of already existing family relationships, arrangements and activities to which adjustment must be made with as little resentment and other negative feelings as possible. These and other possibilities for rejec-

tion of a new child are known to be frequent and are common causes of injury to the individual. The grace of baptism expressed through the fellowship generally and through the family particularly should act as a preventive and corrective of such egocentric attitudes toward the ways of relating to a new individual. If these destructive attitudes prevail in spite of baptism, we must conclude that so far as human participation is concerned the administration of the rite was but a meaningless formality. Let it be remembered, then, that one of the major meanings of baptism is that God accepts the child as an individual in his own right, and that the family of God, the fellowship of God's children, assumes responsibility for the nurture of his individuality in community.

(2) *Love.* Not only does the child need to be accepted as an individual, but he also needs the constant assurance and reassurance that he is loved. The experience of love begins on the physical level of nursing and hunger satisfactions and becomes the basis of later emotional and spiritual experiences of love. This is the time in life when the great need is to be loved. In the first year or two it is practically impossible to express too much love and affection, assuming that the love expressed is wholesome. Studies reveal that there is a direct ratio between being loved and the capacity to love, and they scientifically document the ancient Christian belief that our love of God is not born of ourselves but comes into being in response to our realization of how greatly God loves us. One learns to love only by being loved. Unless the child has had a reasonably complete and wholesome experience of being loved, he will, as he grows older,

continue to seek in inappropriate infantile and childish ways that affection which is his primary need, and will not be able to give affection in appropriate adult ways because he cannot give that which he has not received. The parent, in this matter, is the child's first pattern of God.

The child cannot distinguish between the parents and God. To him the parents are God. He accepts his parents as they are and applies what he learns from them to life and mankind and God. This is the point where religious education begins. If we are loving parents in the wise and wholesome ways of love, the child will receive the necessary foundation experience for recognizing and responding to the love of God. If the relationship between the child and his parents is truly Christian and, therefore, wholesome, the developments of egocentricity in him will be proportionately prevented; if it is not Christian, he will be confirmed in egocentric ways of living.

What does this have to do with baptism? Baptism is the sacramental expression of divine assurances and reassurances of love. The Gospel of which it is an expression is a Gospel of God's love revealed in Christ. The fellowship into which the child is received is the *agápe* fellowship. This being the case, and the child's fundamental need being love, it follows that the fellowship's expression of love should be more specifically articulate in terms of those concrete situations in which the child must grow and mature. The divine love that is expressed in and through baptism is regenerative, redemptive love. He who was born of the will of man, a natural creature, is now, born of the Spirit, a child of God. This means that

the child is born into the environment of the divine love historically manifested in the Christian fellowship. The parents and godparents are the representatives of the fellowship in the expression and ministry of God's love. Many of them are unaware of this responsibility and opportunity and need to be awakened to it; many others of them are conscientious in their assumption of responsibility but need inspired and practical assistance from the church. Furthermore, the character of the life of the Christian fellowship, both in its individual and collective manifestations, should be of a kind that gives loving welcome and encouragement to the child as he moves through the successive stages of his development.

Going back to the responsibility of the parents, it is desirable that they be helped to a Christian conception of the function of parenthood and see it as having more than biological or sociological significance. As has been said before, they are the child's god for several years, and as such they are the introduction, through the character and quality of their relationship to their children, to God the Father. The subject matter of religion and the religious habits of prayer and offering are not the only concerns of religious education. Equally important is the expression of the divine love or the revealing of the divine character in the family situation in the respect with which the parents regard the individuality of the child; in the constant attempt to understand the motives and purposes that lie behind the child's behavior before the behavior is dealt with; in the prayerful endeavor on the part of the parents to overcome their own egocentric motives and attitudes and thus avoid develop-

ment in the child of character-conditioned hostilities; and in a reasonable ordering of the home around the child and his needs, so that the home becomes in fact a local unit of the Christian fellowship and a training school in the life of the Kingdom of God. It is this that baptism symbolizes and demands of the home that would be Christian, and that would really assume responsibility for the personal and social implications of baptism. There is need for a more descriptive and factual discussion of this area of the subject, so that parents and godparents and the whole Christian fellowship may more effectively use their opportunities and meet their responsibilities.

(3) *Discipline.* The child also needs a stable, consistent, understanding, and evenly ordered environment to provide him with a steadyng and supporting influence with which he can meet the mysteries and vicissitudes of growth and maturation. One reason for the need of this kind of influence is that the child by nature is subject to sporadic emotional upheavals and disturbances such as fears, rages, and griefs which clamor for expression or release in overt behavior. These emotional reactions are responses to normal physiological functions that call for understanding assistance on the part of adults, so that the child may be freed from their urgency and disturbance. If such behavior is regarded as moral and ethical in nature, and is handled as such, the child's feelings of guilt and resentment will be unnecessarily and unwisely aroused or increased. Treatment of this kind is one way in which adults reproduce in their children egocentric and destructive attitudes and behavior. The greatest need in these emotional

situations is for sympathetic reassurance that will allay the child's panic and so help him meet the situation more effectively.

A firm framework of life is needed also in order to help the growing individual to relate himself cooperatively to other people—the members of his family, his playmates and schoolmates, and all his ever larger communities. This disciplined framework is essential if the ultimate effects of acceptance and love are to be wholesome and the individual is to grow from a concern with himself that is appropriate to infancy to adult altruism. It is necessary, therefore, for him to enter increasingly into disciplined relationship with other people who have their own interests, needs, and purposes. Out of these factors and by this process society is compounded and the character of social relations is determined. So the child must learn to relate to others, not on the basis of their value to him or to his interests, but on the basis of others as human entities in their own right.

Obedience is a lesson that must be learned as the child matures. And the need for obedience does not need to be justified. It has its roots deep in the nature of the child himself. A boy, aged ten, who had been referred to a clinic because of anti-social behavior said wistfully, "I wish Dad and Mom had made me obey." His home had been without order and consistent discipline, and he had responded with symptoms of insecurity and anxiety which led to rebellion and anti-social behavior. The home is the mediating agency between the individual and the universe into which he is to enter as a responsible person. If the home is unstable, capricious, undependable and

fails to provide a fixed point of reference for the child in a world already bewildering to him, the child of that home, because of his confusion and frustration, will exhibit hostile and aggressive behavior. His relations with people instead of being outgoing and altruistic will be withdrawn, defensive and egocentric.

The administration of discipline and the imperative for obedience is fraught with many complex problems. Harm is done the child's integrity when obedience is demanded for obedience's sake. The requirement of obedience must be reasonable and relevant to the understanding and capacity of the child. Obedience is not an impersonal and legal mandate but is a personal relationship which calls for cooperation between the person who bears the authority and the person who is the authority's responsibility. There is need, therefore, to provide real opportunities for the child to make his own judgments and choices, and to experience the natural consequences, within protective limits, of his judgments and choices whether they be good or bad, fortunate or unfortunate. This kind of discipline in freedom enables the child to learn the inviolabilities of life creatively and with a minimum of confusion and anxiety. By this process the growing individual learns the laws of God and man, learns to relate to them constructively, and is not under compulsion to pit himself aggressively against them. As he grows older, the external laws by which he was patiently governed will become internalized, and in his maturity he will find himself in possession of a mature conscience. He will relate to people righteously not because of laws that prevent him from doing otherwise,

but because of a genuine fellow feeling, respect for, and love of his neighbor.

These insights about discipline and its conditions are introduced to illuminate the symbolical significance of baptism with regard to this aspect of the baptized child's maturing life. The Christian fellowship into which he is received is rooted and grounded in the Law of God. Furthermore, it is an ordered and disciplined fellowship, or should be. On the other hand, it has been delivered from the tyranny and fear of the Law by its faith in the triumphant Christ. Through faith in Him and by union in His love the members of the fellowship may hope to fulfil the Law. But the little children of the fellowship, passing, as they do, through the primitive stages of development, must learn that there is a law and must learn obedience to it if they are to come to that state of Christian maturity in which the laws of God dwell within them, and they find their security in their faith in the love and mercy of God. The adult members of the fellowship, because of their new relationship to the law, should be characteristically understanding, patient, and helpful in the administration of the law with their children. It is to this process of loving discipline that baptism symbolically points, and the rite is not complete until the Christian fellowship, through parents, godparents and others, undertake and bring it to some degree of fruition.

An attempt has been made to show that the ministry of baptism is the ministry of the Christian fellowship to the child in terms of his needs and the natural processes of his unfolding nature. The fellowship is thus the servant of the Covenant between God and the child, of which relationship the sacrament of

baptism is the source, the sign, and the seal.

(4) *Significance for Adult Baptism.* The message of baptism and its implications can be used for therapy as well as for prevention. Both processes should be understood as included in the idea of redemption. The preventive task of the fellowship is to raise up its children, as has been indicated, patiently and studiously with benefit of both Christian and scientific insights. In this way the children of the fellowship may be brought to maturity with fewer personal and social disabilities and with a maximum chance to make a constructive response to Christ when they are confronted by Him. Such is the preventive side of the matter which grows out of the symbolical significance of baptism.

On the therapeutic side, we need to remember that men and women retain their need for acceptance, love, and understanding discipline throughout life; that because of the egocentricity and sin of the culture in which they live and grow, their need for these qualities has never been adequately satisfied and a consequent longing for them is expressed in all manner of egocentric, frustrated and unwholesome ways of living that produce physical, emotional, and social ills. Thousands of these people have been baptised, most of them in their infancy; yet too many of them do not sense the meaning of baptism in relation to the unhappy condition of their lives. Life in the fellowship too often hurts the little ones of God, both infants and adults. The indifference and impersonality of present-day conventional Christianity produces an unchristian fellowship that raises up new generations whose religion is humanistic and sec-

tarian, and whose way of life combines the worst features of individualism and aggression, the ritual fact of baptism to the contrary notwithstanding. The pastor, in counseling these people, has the opportunity to bring to bear upon their problems the meaning and help of baptism: that through the sacrament they are accepted by God as His children and members of His family; that they are the objects of the divine love that does not vary, is indestructible, and seeks not its own (is not egocentric); and that they are supported by a mercy which tempers the terror of an otherwise merciless and frustrating law. People can be helped to find a place in the fellowship of Christians where they will experience these divine qualities and, in their turn, increasingly manifest them in their own lives. The fellowship thus becomes a society in which the destructive, egocentric forces of contemporary culture are combatted by love, justice, and mercy.

### III. THE ADMINISTRATION OF HOLY BAPTISM

The personal and social implications of baptism, as have been indicated cannot be realized as the sacrament is now being administered. The present situation is scandalous. Clergy are confessedly and sometimes unashamedly baptising children whose parents have no regard for Christian teaching or living, or for the Church and her sacraments. Rarely does one hear of preparation for baptism. Too often the baptismal party arrives at the appointed hour in an empty church. Awkwardly they go through the strange ten or fifteen minute ritual, the archaic language of which thoroughly mystifies and sometimes frightens them, and then return home

with a piece of paper called a baptismal certificate. Often the people of the parish who by implication are participants in the rite do not know that it has taken place. Baptism so administered is only an empty remnant of a dead past. As a possible corrective of these conditions the following suggestions are made.

Prepare the parents, godparents, and the congregation for every administration of the rite. As soon as it is known that parents have children for baptism, the minister should visit them; explain briefly and simply the meaning and implications of the sacrament; counsel with them about the selection of godparents; arrange to have a longer session with them and the godparents if and when all of them can get together; encourage them to have the baptism at a service of public worship; and require that both parents and godparents read the service of baptism before the next meeting and be prepared to ask questions. At the proposed meeting the minister should go through the service with them, explaining its meaning and the order of the service. Encourage questions and discussion, and endeavor in every possible way to help them understand the full meaning of the sacrament. It must be made clear to them that the baptismal experience and their responsibility does not end with the benediction, but continues indefinitely; that the service is not the end but the beginning of responsibility. Then the parents and godparents should be given specific instruction as to how they can carry out the implications of baptism in and through their respective relations to the child. The latter instruction concerns the insights that were discussed in Part II of this article. Our people must be trained in this interpretation and appli-

cation of the sacrament; primarily, it is the responsibility of the clergy.

The congregations must also be instructed in the meaning of baptism. If public baptism becomes more common, there will be natural occasions for instruction. Certainly the sermon at such services should be on the subject of baptism, its meaning, its implication for personal and social life, the responsibilities of the congregation, and how these responsibilities can be met. Added opportunities for instruction are to be had in the meetings of parish groups a week or so before a public administration of the sacrament, when the minister may talk to the people more intimately and informally about its meaning and their relationship to it. As a matter of normal routine practice, no parish meeting of any kind should be held without some truth or practice of the Christian faith being presented to the members. Our Lord's oft repeated command was that we should teach.

We come now to the service itself. The rubries require that it be held in the church, and further suggest that the rite be held at the time of a public service of worship. It is practically impossible to convey the full meaning of baptism in any other way. The little children should be received personally by the worshipping fellowship. Such an act of worship strengthens the sense of fellowship. A public service of baptism can be held in a parish at least three or four times a year and many of the candidates can be held over for such a service. When this is done, however, it will be necessary for the fonts to be pulled out of the closets and corners where they have been hidden, dusted off, and put in a conspicuous and symbolically appropriate place where the service can be

held in a dignified and convenient manner. The service of baptism itself needs revision, but it also needs revision in relation to its use with Morning and Evening Prayer. A discussion of the particular revisions that might be helpful is a subject, however, beyond the scope of this study.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Baptism is the sacramental affirmation of God's proclamation that persons are important as persons, in contradiction to the perversions of modern culture which reduce them to the status of things and value them in terms of their functions. A child of man can enter into no greater relationship than that of being a child of God. It should mean, among many things, protection from the distortions of egocentricity, from insecurity, from the necessity of defensive living and from all the evils that result therefrom. It should mean that those who are received in baptism thereby enter into a fellowship that accepts, loves, and nurtures them with understanding, patience, and a skill which is illumined by both religious and scientific insights. Nurture as a part of Christian experience is important and always will be. The healthier the nurture, the more complete the experience of Christ will be when it comes.

Baptism symbolizes and should effect a new society under God. Since all its members are children of God, its life should be marked by an equality in community, and by unmistakable manifestations of God's redeeming energy at work within its own membership and in relation to those outside the fellowship. The fellowship is born of baptism; and yet it is also responsible for the operation of the grace of baptism. To main-

tain the true quality of Christian fellowship, the new society must be a believing, worshiping and working community. Baptism without faith is nonsense. It follows, then, that infant baptism will be undertaken only when, according to human estimates on the basis of faith, the proxy-faith of the persons responsible—parents and godparents—can be determined and instructed beforehand. The characteristics of Christian fellowship should be manifested also in the local life of each home, which then becomes an integral and harmonious part of the whole Christian community. The experience of baptism should produce a distinguishable difference in the character of family relations, particularly with respect to the parents' understanding and treatment of their children.

The ministry of baptism is a teaching ministry, since the rite occasions instruction of the congregation, the godparents and the parents in which all, not only the clergy, participate. We must rediscover and dedicate ourselves to this teaching mission in order that the personal and social implications of baptism be realized.

Finally, the sacrament is evangelical in nature. Baptism, proclaiming the good news of the Gospel, incorporates those who respond into the community of the faithful, sending them out into the world as messengers of a new relationship which is the gift of God to the individual and to society.

And so with the whole congregation of Christ's flock we give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits; and with one accord make our prayers unto him that all who are brought to baptism may lead the rest of their lives according to this beginning.

## THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION TODAY

By JOHN S. HIGGINS

Gethsemane Church, Minneapolis

The world-wide Anglican communion is made up of eleven completely autonomous churches: England; Wales; Scotland; Ireland; Canada; the United States; West Indies; South Africa; India, Burma, and Ceylon; Australia and Tasmania; and New Zealand. There are also missionary provinces and dioceses in varying stages towards their ultimate goal, self-government. All the Anglican dioceses throughout the world total three hundred and seventeen, and the baptized membership is some thirty millions. The ideal is that of a family of churches all with equal status, tied in with, but not tied down to, the see of Canterbury. These churches are in voluntary association, and they are united in the doctrine, faith and practice contained in the Book of Common Prayer.

The Church of England, from which Anglicanism sprung, traces its history back to the British era, for there were bishops in England before the third century; and from there back to the times of the apostles which were at Jerusalem. The emphasis on and necessity for continuity are indelible marks of Anglicanism. The Anglican church, which at first was the ecclesiastical extension of England, is not much more than three centuries old, but within that time there has grown up a world-wide church. When the two small provinces of Canterbury and York severed their ecclesiastical ties with Rome in the middle sixteenth century, it would have

seemed unlikely that so small a mustard seed would grow into so great a tree. Anglicanism is unique, for it is the only church in Christendom which is catholic yet reformed, constitutional while apostolic, national yet world-wide.

At first the growth of the Anglican church followed closely the political expansion of England, and in the earliest years of Empire what Anglican church there was existed beyond Great Britain in the persons of sundry chaplains sailing with Elizabeth's freebooters, and with the lumbering East Indiamen on their tedious voyage around the Cape.

The loss of the American colonies as a result of the Revolutionary War deprived the Church of England of a most promising work overseas. But the loss of the American colonies was compensated by the growth of the "second empire" in Canada, India, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and many another area and island. Today this "second empire" covers twelve million square miles, a quarter of the earth's land surface, and it contains some five hundred and fifty million people. Four hundred million of these live in India and Burma.

This second empire is both a commonwealth and an empire, for it falls into three distinct groupings. There are first the fully self-governing commonwealths: the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Eire. In the second grouping comes India, which is well on the way towards

self-government but has not yet achieved it. Third is the dependent or colonial empire, the fifty-five dependencies of which, vastly different in area, race, creed, and civilization, contain sixty-three million inhabitants. They are in various stages towards self-government.

The Anglican communion consists likewise of three groupings. First come the completely autonomous churches of England; Wales; Scotland; Ireland; Canada; Australia; New Zealand; India, Burma, and Ceylon; South Africa; West Indies; United States. In the second grouping are the churches in China, Japan and the Philippines, which have a large measure of self-government. The first two are for all practical purposes provinces of the Anglican church. The third category consists of the many other dioceses and missionary districts scattered across the globe, ranging from the tiny diocese of St. Helena with its population of four thousand and an area of a hundred and twenty-five square miles, to the diocese of the Niger with six million people living in its boundaries which encompass one hundred thousand square miles. These dioceses are in widely different stages along the road to autonomy.

The last Lambeth Conference, held in 1930, declared the Anglican church to be a "Fellowship within the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces, or Regional Churches in communion with the see of Canterbury." These churches are bound together voluntarily by their desire to uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. They are national churches, bound together, not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by

the mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference.

#### THE AUTONOMOUS CHURCHES

*The Church of England.* The English reformers were successful in their primary object which was to throw off the Papal yoke. They were not so successful in setting forth a reformed faith which would bind all Englishmen to its allegiance. By the time of Charles I it was evident that neither Papist nor Separatist would conform of their own free wills, nor would force prevail in the end. The Church lost ground, and in 1717 its mouthpiece, Convocation, was suppressed and was not revived again for a hundred and thirty-five years. There being no means for the Church to speak, it could neither maintain its own internal discipline nor play its part as the conscience of the nation. This must account in no small measure for the apathy towards missionary opportunities in this period.

There were some bright spots in the eighteenth century however, not the least of these being the founding of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) in 1698, and of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (S.P.G.) in 1701. These two societies did not do much at first, but they represented about the total missionary interest of an indifferent church, bound hand and foot by state control. Both societies were destined to play tremendous and increasing parts in the extension of Anglicanism beyond Great Britain. Much later came the founding of the Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.) in 1799 for Africa and the East.

The rapid expansion of the Empire in the latter half of the eighteenth cen-

tury made necessary some provision for army and garrison chaplains, both for the Englishmen who went abroad for trade and for the soldiers and garrisons. The government felt no responsibility for the natives of the colonies, and even the Church felt that the primary duty of its clergy abroad was to take the Church of England to Englishmen away from home. Whenever a colony grew to sufficient importance a civil governor was sent, who often was the Ordinary until a bishop was dispatched some time later. Even with the advent of bishops in the various colonies, the Imperial government was never better than neutral and was often actively hostile to any evangelical work among the natives in the colonies. The salaries of these bishops were always paid from public funds, for in the beginnings of Empire the Church was established in the new possessions just as it was at home. Bishoprics were created as if they were peerages, by letters patent. But from 1841 onwards the process of disestablishing the Church in the colonies began and the process was almost completed by 1870.

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed a remarkable development of new dioceses outside the British Isles, for whereas in 1840 there were but ten of these, their number had increased by 1861 to no less than forty-one. Anticipating the trend towards disestablishment, which carried with it disendowment, the Colonial Bishoprics Fund was founded in 1841 for the endowment of new missionary dioceses. The Fund received almost one million pounds from its founding until the turn of the century, and it was instrumental in providing sixty-seven new bishoprics in the colonies in that time.

This phenomenal growth, with its accompanying increase of problems, made advisable the calling of the first Lambeth Conference in 1867 by the Archbishop of Canterbury. There were now one hundred and forty-four Anglican bishops, and seventy-six of these accepted and attended the Conference. Forty-seven of these came from outside the British Isles. Since that day six other Conferences have been held, the last in 1930 when three hundred and seven bishops came. The metropolitans included in this number represented eighteen different provinces of the Church, a number indicative of the rapid spread of Anglicanism in the sixty-three years.

There are two provinces, Canterbury with twenty-nine dioceses, and York with fourteen; both provinces have their Convocations consisting of an Upper House of diocesans, and a Lower House of deans, archdeacons and other clergy. Over half of the Lower House is elected. The governing body of the Church of England is called the Church Assembly, which is made up of the combined convocations of Canterbury and York plus the House of Laity. The laity are elected every five years at diocesan conferences. This Church Assembly came about as a result of the Enabling Act of 1919 and the Powers Measure two years later. It marks a notable step towards the democratising of the Church. The Assembly may and does refer matters requiring Parliamentary sanction to the fifteen members of Commons' Ecclesiastical Committee, which committee has power to initiate legislation in Parliament. The latter body may accept or reject such legislation but may not amend it.

There is at present a strong desire to

go a step farther in democratisation and have the church elect its own bishops and archbishops. There are no figures available of the baptized membership, but twenty million is a maximum figure.

The Church is present also in Wales, Scotland, and Ireland as autonomous groups of christians. Until the Welsh Church Act of 1914 (effective 1920), which caused disestablishment, the Welsh dioceses were looked after, sometimes not very well, by the Church of England. Now, in spite of the tremendous strain caused by the Church Act, the six dioceses are a closely knit unit, with about three-quarters of a million members. In Scotland, where the establishment is presbyterian, Anglicans are not very numerous although there are seven dioceses, with a constitutional government, and about one hundred and sixty-four thousand members. The Church of Ireland was finally disestablished in 1871 after long years of sorry relationship with the Church of England. There are two provinces and thirteen dioceses, and since 1921, when Eire became independent, it has been known as one of the "recognized churches" of that country, and its membership is about four hundred and ninety thousand.

*The Episcopal Church in the United States.* Although Chaplain Robert Hunt offered his historic service at Jamestown fourteen years before the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth Rock, the Bishop of London, Compton, was heard to remark sixty-eight years later that there were "scarce four ministers of our Church in the vast tract of North America." It was his duty to be concerned, for an Order in Council of 1633 had made the Bishop of London

diocesan for the colonies. In spite of the three hundred missionaries sent by S.P.G. in the colonial period, the disastrous effects of having no bishops in that era, together with the effects of the Revolution, caused the Episcopal church to get a very slow start in its missionary expansion. It was not until 1835 that a vigorous missionary policy was set forth and acted on by the whole Church. Fortunately the Civil War caused no permanent cleavage, and the latter half of the nineteenth century brought strong and sometimes remarkable growth, both at home and abroad. To-day the Church has eight provinces, with seventy-four dioceses, and fifteen domestic missionary districts. There also are sixteen overseas missionary jurisdictions.

*The Church of England in Canada.* While Great Britain acquired Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Hudson's Bay in 1713, it was not until Wolfe had defeated Montcalm (1759) that Britain acquired Canada from France. The American revolution had taught the Foreign Office a thing or two and bishops were provided for Nova Scotia in 1787 and for Quebec in 1793. This was amazing speed compared with the Imperial performance in colonial America. The Church spread westward with vigor, assisted by the United Empire Loyalists, and when state support was withdrawn in Upper and Lower Canada in 1854, the Church made provision for its own government. The bishops called their clergy and laity to meetings called synods, for the government of the respective dioceses; and although they were illegal at first, they were made legal by Acts of 1857 and 1858. A decade later bishops were consecrated without

a royal license. In 1893 the various dioceses were called to the first General Synod, where a Primate was elected. Today there are four provinces with their archbishops, twenty-seven dioceses and some one million seven hundred and fifty thousand baptized members.

*The Church of the Province of the West Indies.* The eight dioceses of this province are spread over a very large area of sea and land: Antigua, Barbados, British Honduras, British Guiana, Jamaica, Nassau, Trinidad and the Windward Islands. Barbados was the first to come under British rule in 1605, and Lord Carlisle's grant in 1627 instructs him to care for the propagation of the Christian faith as well as the enlargement of his Majesty's dominions. The West Indies were of vital importance to England, for without them she could never have succeeded in her long struggle with Napoleonic France. Codrington College was established in 1703 and shortly after began to be used as a clergy training school, which proved of inestimable benefit not alone for the Church but for the educating of the slaves gradually emancipated by the Imperial decree of 1834. A Bishop was authorized for Barbados in 1824, and other dioceses were added, British Honduras being the last in 1883. Disestablishment came between 1868 and 1870, only thirty years after the trials of emancipation. In all the dioceses except Barbados there are only vestiges of state control, but Barbados has its own established Church, with a Bishop and clergy paid from public funds. The Prayer Book of the province is the English one but it has the permissive use of the Mass from the Prayer Book of Edward VI. Of late years economic conditions have been

serious and call for united action. The Episcopal church has five missionary jurisdictions in that area, and their problems are similar to those of the Church of the Province of the West Indies and call for a united approach. Total membership for the province is well over a million.

*The Church of the Province of South Africa.* The Dutch were the first Europeans to hold the Cape, which they picturesquely called the "Tavern of the Ocean." By the time they were comfortably settled and expecting to stay, the British took it from them in 1806, for it was a vital provisioning point, in those days before the Suez Canal, for the vast fleet of East Indiamen. Little was done churchwise, although several bishops stopped at the Cape to confirm and ordain. S.P.G. sent missionaries there in 1806, but C.M.S. was devoting all its considerable efforts on the Slave Coast and could spare neither time nor money for the Cape. But the Colonial Bishoprics Fund made possible the endowment of the Capetown diocese in 1847, and the singularly able Robert Gray served there with both distinction and heartache for twenty-five years. Capetown passed from the status of a Crown Colony to representative government in 1853, and Gray erected two new dioceses, Natal and Grahamstown, in that year. Gray became metropolitan and the Church passed from establishment to self-support. The first provincial synod was held in 1870, and forty years before the Union of South Africa the Church had its own constitution. Dioceses began to multiply in spite of the bad feeling engendered by the various native and the two Boer wars. Nowhere in the world is the racial problem

so intense as in South Africa, where the natives outnumber the whites five to one. Christianity has this serious problem which is not present in Mohammedanism, and the native African is drawn strongly to the Moslem faith on this account and also because the African and Moslem traditions of polygamy are identical. In spite of these deterrents an increasing number of young natives are offering themselves for the ministry. The Province with its fourteen dioceses covers a somewhat larger area than the Union, for it includes what was German S. W. Africa, Southern Rhodesia, and Lebombo. There are well over six hundred thousand members, and the province has its own Prayer Book.

*The Province of India, Burma and Ceylon.* The great peninsular sub-continent called India contains one-fifth of the world's population, almost 389 millions. A perpetual difficulty remains in the fact that sixty-eight per cent. are Hindus and twenty-two per cent. are Moslems.

The British East India Company, founded in 1600, began its first small trading station at Surat in 1614. In little over two centuries the Company had smashed the power of both the French and the Great Mogul and had made itself the *de facto* ruler of India. Chaplains had been appointed since early days, but with the understanding that no attempts must be made to convert the Hindus. Conversions were thought to be bad for business. S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. had for a time to support Danish missionaries who were free to work with the natives.

But the evangelical revival in England had its effect, and when the Com-

pany's charter came up for revision in 1813 the great William Wilberforce pushed through various reforms which made the Company responsible for encouraging Christian missionary effort. The bishopric of Calcutta was established in 1814, and with thirty-two clergy the Bishop began to establish the Anglican church in the area of his responsibility, which included Ceylon, the Straits Settlements and later Australia. New dioceses came fairly quickly, with Madras in 1835, Bombay in 1837, and Colombo in 1845. Calcutta was the metropolitan see. The Indian Mutiny of 1857 caused the Imperial government to take over India from the Company by the Proclamation of 1858, and since that time several series of reforms have been instituted, always in the direction of added self-government.

For the Church autonomy was achieved before the State, for by the India Church Act of 1927 the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon was separated from the Church of England and it became a self-governing unit of the Anglican church. A constitution was adopted in 1930. Today there are fifteen dioceses and close to a million members. The Church has its own Prayer Book. Particularly pressing in India has been the need for church unity and in consequence the five southern dioceses have been permitted to merge with the United Church of South India. This latter body contains Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Reformed and Congregationalists.

*The Church of England in Australia and Tasmania* is still the somewhat anomalous title of the vigorous Church in the Antipodes. When, in the year 1770, Captain Cook hove to His Majes-

ty's three hundred and seventy ton ship *Endeavor* off what is now Victoria he found a fertile land and good harbors. Since political prisoners might no longer be sent to the American colonies, the Imperial government could think of no better place for future undesirables than Australia. Accordingly, in 1788 some eight hundred convicts guarded by two hundred soldiers landed at Botany Bay now Sydney. A chaplain did accompany them, but it took the combined efforts of the S.P.G., Bishop Porteus of London, and Wilberforce to persuade the government that the shipload needed spiritual care. Some other missionaries went out from time to time, but matters came to a head in 1829, when the Iron Duke, hearing of the spiritual condition of the colonists, got William Broughton appointed Archdeacon of New South Wales. Broughton became the first bishop of Australia in 1836, a cathedral was erected at Sydney, and by 1847 four new dioceses came into being. New South Wales was granted a constitution in that same year and a partly-elected council. The other states followed until the Australian Commonwealth Constitution was agreed upon and enacted in 1900.

Since 1847 twenty new dioceses have been added, making a total of twenty-five, with four provinces. Three of these dioceses are not attached to any province. Steps towards autonomy were taken as early as 1868 when Broughton held his first synod, and four years later the first general synod took place.

Perhaps the most romantic diocese of the Church in Australia is New Guinea, founded in 1898. Missionary work had begun seven years earlier, and now, fifty-four years later, nearly four hundred miles of coastline along the eastern

tip of the Island is dotted with mission stations. The natives built a fine cathedral at Dogura in 1939, its site being a former battleground for cannibal natives. During the present war and the invasion of the Island by the Japanese, nine missionaries have given up their lives.

The Church in Australia has more than two and a half million members, or some forty per cent. of the population.

*The Church of the Province of New Zealand.* The diocese of Auckland was founded a year after the British Captain Hobson hoisted the Union Jack over New Zealand in 1840. Missionary work with the Maoris had been done since 1814 and Broughton had visited and confirmed at the missions in 1838. It was largely at Broughton's insistence that such prompt action was taken and that G. A. Selwyn was consecrated first bishop of New Zealand in 1841. The story of the founding of the Church there is largely the story of Selwyn's life, for he did not relinquish jurisdiction there until 1868. He called the first synod in 1844, and four years after this the bishops were chosen by the Church in New Zealand and were consecrated there. An Australasian Board of Missions formed at Sydney in 1850 had as its primary purpose the conversion of Melanesia. As a consequence John Coleridge Patteson became first bishop of that area in 1861, and he was murdered by natives at Nukepi ten years later. Today the diocese has a church membership of thirty-six thousand, and the Christian natives have given tremendous assistance to our armed forces.

The Church in New Zealand has nine dioceses and a membership of more than five hundred and twenty thousand.

*The Holy Catholic Church in China.* The American Church began missionary work at Canton in 1835, seven years before the five Treaty Ports were opened to foreign missionaries. William J. Boone, consecrated as first missionary bishop of Amoy in 1839, soon moved his headquarters to Shanghai at the mouth of the Yang-tze River. The Church of England followed by sending S.P.G. missionaries in 1843 and the C.M.S. did likewise in 1849. In this latter year the first English bishopric was established at Victoria (Hong Kong). There was still bitter resentment by the Chinese of the British government's opium policy, which in turn caused much difficulty for the missionaries as late as 1864. The English Church went ahead with establishing a diocese in North China in 1872 and later one in Mid-China. So it was that the English worked in the north, south and middle, while the American mission worked into the interior from Shanghai along the great river. A unified approach became increasingly necessary and desirable, but not until 1909 did the American, English, and Canadian missions come together to form the Holy Catholic Church of China. It is substantially an autonomous province of the Anglican Church, although some episcopal salaries are paid by outside mission boards. There are thirteen dioceses, and before the war the Church reported some sixty-one thousand baptized members. The unparalleled destruction of the war which China has endured since 1937 and the accompanying mass movements west make any statistics of no value. It is quite evident both from private utterance and government proclamation that the Chinese people now have friendly feelings towards Christian missionaries. Other provinces

of the Anglican church will have to give much material assistance in the post-war years.

*The Japan Holy Catholic Church.* The American church sent two missionaries to Japan six years after Perry's adventure in Tokyo Bay. Ten years later, in 1869, C.M.S. began work at Nagasaki, and the S.P.G. followed in 1873. These early missionaries endured bitter persecution and their results were quite frugal. The three groups worked independently at first, for the Americans consecrated a bishop, Channing Moore Williams, for Japan and China in 1866, and the British sent a bishop in 1883. For some time the three missions had used a common Prayer Book, and there was an increasing desire to come together. Accordingly, in 1887 a general synod was called and the Holy Catholic Church of Japan came into existence. Before the war there were ten dioceses and about twenty-four thousand members, and the Japanese clergy and lay workers largely outnumbered the missionaries. All missionaries were ordered by the government to resign from executive positions in 1940, but the Japanese church was able to survive this for she had capable leadership. The government also ordered an end to all foreign subsidies, which caused grave difficulty. During the present war the government has, apparently, ordered all "Protestant" churches to merge into one. The present status of the Church of Japan awaits the end of hostilities.

*Missionary Dioceses.* In addition to the above autonomous Churches there are eight dioceses in *East Africa* which appear to be well on their way towards becoming a provincial unit. Anglican

work in this area began with the founding of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa in 1859. It is an area hallowed by the names of Mackenzie, Mackay, Steere, Tozer, Hannington, and Weston. Some amazingly successful work is being done here, and outstanding is the diocese of the Upper Nile, which five years ago reported a church membership of one hundred and forty-two thousand. In *West Africa* there are six dioceses, somewhat scattered along the lower end of the "Bulge." Five are English and one American. Work in this area was begun by S.P.G. in 1751 at Sierra Leone, and for a hundred years and more missions on that coast were prosecuted at huge loss of life, and in the face of intense opposition by the slavers. The diocese of the Niger currently reports 123,415 baptized members. The neighboring diocese of Lagos has about the same figure. It should not be long before these six dioceses form a provincial organization.

Besides the autonomous and semi-autonomous churches, and the groups of adjacent missionary dioceses, there are fourteen other dioceses not included above. Some are tiny like the Island of Bermuda and others are huge areas as is the Diocese of Argentina and Eastern South America. To these British dioceses must be added the missionary responsibilities of the American church in Mexico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands.

These three hundred and seventeen dioceses comprising the Anglican church have been founded over a period of thirteen hundred and forty-two years. The first was Canterbury in 597 and the last Bhagalpur in 1939. It is no longer the Church of England in the colonies,

as a glance at the names of dioceses and bishops will reveal. Calcutta has its Tarafdar, Lahore its Bannerjee, Osaka its Naide, Shensi its Tzu Kae Shen, Korea its Kudo, Lagos its Akinyele, the Niger its Onyeabo. It is the Church of many peoples and kindreds and tongues. This is a Catholic church indeed; and its unity may not be lightly broken.

The Anglican church has long ago recorded her willingness to discuss church unity with any other Christian body on the basis of the Lambeth quadrilateral. This quadrilateral statement has proven most helpful in negotiations with Protestant bodies, but a great hindrance in dealing with the Orthodox churches. The latter point out that the quadrilateral totally ignores tradition and that it limits all dogmatic development to the first four centuries. However, five out of the eleven autonomous Orthodox churches have recognized the validity of Anglican orders. Since Orthodoxy probably can claim some one hundred and fifty million members, the possibility of a union between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism cannot be dismissed, especially since present relations between the two Churches are very cordial.

The Scandinavian churches are another fruitful field for Anglicans, and already we have achieved intercommunion with the Swedish national church. With the end of hostilities in Europe the interrupted negotiations with the churches of Norway, Denmark, and Finland can doubtless be revived. The four Scandinavian churches probably have a combined membership of sixteen millions.

Said Archbishop Temple at his enthronement in 1942: "We shall impoverish our service of the wider fellowship

if we let our membership of our own Communion become hesitant or indefinite. Rather we should make strong the bonds of our own unity, with gratitude for our splendid inheritance, so that we may bring to the universal Church a life strong in faith, in order, in corporate devotion."

The unity of this world-wide Church has been long abuilding, and its bonds are more precious because of their voluntary nature. Whatever plans any Anglican church may make for reunion with another Christian body, it must also consider what effect that reunion might have on the whole Anglican communion. Local reunions which endanger the integrity of the Anglican branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church may have the ultimate effect of retarding the whole Ecumenical movement.

#### Bibliography

Barry, Alfred, *The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England*, Macmillan, 1895 (out of print).

Church Assembly, *The Official Year Book of the Church of England*, S.P.C.K., 1940.

Curtis, William R., *The Lambeth Conferences*, Columbia, 1942.

Higgins, John, *The Expansion of the Anglican Communion*, Cloister, 1942.

Jenkins, C., and Mackenzie, K. D., *Episcopacy, Ancient and Modern*, S.P.C.K., 1930.

Malden, R. H., *This Church and Realm*, Oxford University Press, 1931 (out of print).

#### Topics for Discussion

(1) Would the missionary work of the Episcopal church be prosecuted more vigorously through missionary societies similar to S.P.G. and C.M.S.?

(2) In the light of the Ecumenical Movement, what is the place of the Anglican church in Christendom?

(3) What further developments are desirable in knitting the Anglican church closer together?

(4) Would the historic continuity of Anglicanism be broken, and its sacraments impaired, through union with another non-episcopal church?

## THE TEACHING OF FIRST PETER

By FRANCIS WRIGHT BEARE

Presbyterian Theological College, Montreal

1. *The Date of the Epistle.* The First Epistle of Peter is now regarded by most scholars as a pseudonymous work written about the end of the first century, in the reign either of Domitian (81-96 A.D.) or of Trajan (98-117 A.D.). It was published in its present form in the provinces of Asia Minor, and was probably composed by a Christian teacher of that region, though it may have been sent from Rome. In my own opinion, the references to persecution in the closing verses of the fourth

chapter correspond so exactly to the description of Pliny's methods as they are set forth in his Letter to Trajan (Book 10, Epistle 96), that we are entirely justified in concluding that it was written at that very time, i.e. 111-112 A.D., and it is quite likely that it had its origin in one of the cities of the province of Bithynia and Pontus. This great region, on the south shore of the Black Sea, was taken from the jurisdiction of the Roman Senate and put under the direct authority of the Emperor at this

time, because Trajan was about to begin a series of great campaigns on his eastern frontier, against the Parthian Empire, and he wished to secure his main lines of communication with the Danubian provinces, which were to provide him with the necessary supplies of food and of re-inforcements; and the main highway between the Danube and the Euphrates ran through the heart of Bithynia. Galatia and Cappadocia were already governed by a legate of the Emperor, and Pliny was now sent out to re-organize the administration of Bithynia and Pontus, and to set everything in readiness for the passage of the Imperial legions which were to be drawn from Europe to humble the pride of Parthia. The peace of this province had frequently been disturbed in the recent past by gangs, organized in the cities, composed of desperate men of the slave class and of the poverty-stricken tradesmen and manual laborers. This sort of thing was endemic—so much so that Trajan actually refused permission to organize a fire-brigade in the capital city of the province on the ground that once such a group was formed, however laudable the purpose, it was practically certain to turn itself into a gang, and to become a danger to the public peace.<sup>1</sup> Pliny, therefore, was particularly determined to root out all such seditious organizations. In Christianity he found numerous groups, drawn almost entirely from the lowest classes, stubbornly refusing to do the customary honor to the Emperor's image, holding secret meetings at daybreak, and carrying on a propaganda which had led to widespread desertion of the temples and to something like a general collapse of

the normal religious life of the province. Though he was unable to find evidence of actual criminal activity, he felt it necessary to do all in his power to stamp out a movement which seemed to him to be "a wicked and arrogant superstition," and he executed all who refused to renounce it and to curse Christ, when they were brought to trial. There is no evidence that a State persecution of this type was undertaken at any earlier period in this area; Pliny's letter itself shows that this experienced official had never in his life been present at the trial of a Christian and had to seek advice about the proper procedure, although he had been in the public service at Rome and in other parts of the Empire for years. It is apparent, too, that there was nothing in the official records of the province to guide him; he had to look to Rome for the necessary advice. These are the considerations, in brief, which incline us to hold that the conditions which called forth First Peter existed in the time of Pliny's tenure of office in Bithynia and Pontus, and not at any earlier period.

2. *The Problem of Authorship.* If this late date be accepted, it follows that St. Peter cannot have been the writer, for there is no reason to reject the tradition that he suffered martyrdom at Rome in the time of Nero, more than forty years earlier. But there are sound reasons for our refusal to accept it as coming from the hand of the Apostle, quite apart from the references to persecution. For one thing, the style and language are those of a man of letters; it contains some of the most polished Greek prose in the New Testament. St. Peter, however, was a Galilean fisherman, brought up speaking a Semitic

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, *Letters*, Bk. 10, 34.

tongue (Aramaic), and he reached middle life without having learned to read and write his native language, let alone Greek (*ἀγράμματος*—Acts 4, 13—not “unlearned,” but actually “illiterate”). Again, the writer of this letter makes continual use of the Pauline Epistles, especially Romans and Ephesians, while he offers no personal reminiscences of Jesus, and only a few echoes of His words. It is impossible to imagine Peter relying upon Paul so much more heavily than upon Jesus. Yet again, this writer is steeped in the Greek translation of the Old Testament; not only does he quote it freely, but its words and its turns of expression come freely to his pen; but there is not a word to indicate that he had ever been a practising Jew, or that the religion of Judaism was a problem to him, as it certainly was to St. Paul. For him, the Old Testament is a Christian book from start to finish, and its significance lies in its testimony to the sufferings that Christ was to bear and the glory that should follow; he never thinks of it as the book of the Law of God, embodying a principle of religion which is now superseded by Grace. Finally, he seems to exhibit an acquaintance with the principles and practices of the Oriental Mystery-cults,<sup>2</sup> and a tendency to appropriate their technical language for his own Christian purposes, in a manner that suggests a period later than the Apostolic Age and a knowledge that Peter would not have had the means of acquiring. Thus there are many strong reasons for holding that Peter cannot

have been the writer; but it must be said that there is no clue to help us determine who the true author may have been. We can only say that he was probably an elder or bishop of one of the Asiatic churches in the early years of the second century.<sup>3</sup>

3. *The Composite Structure of the Epistle.* Writing under the name of Peter, then, this unknown teacher sends a message of encouragement and exhortation to the Christians of Asia Minor, to help them stand firm against an outbreak of terrible persecution. But when his letter is analysed, it becomes clear that it was not all written under the shadow of the terror. He has incorporated into it a discourse on the meaning of the Christian life, with some practical directions for Christian conduct in a heathen environment—a discourse that may well have been prepared in the first instance for a band of converts on the occasion of their baptism.<sup>4</sup> Many of those who were to read the letter had heard him speak to them, perhaps in these very words, on that day when they first professed their faith in Christ and were made members of His Church through the sacrament of regeneration. Now, before he mentions the “fiery ordeal” which has come upon them in all its fury, he repeats the teaching that they had received from his lips in more peaceful days, as if to remind them “that this is the true grace

<sup>2</sup> R. Perdelwitz, *Die Mysterienreligion und das Problem des ersten Petrusbriefes*, Giessen, 1911. Zweiter Teil, *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem*. Cf. the commentary of H. Gunkel in *Die Schriften des N.T.*<sup>3</sup>, Bd. 3, Göttingen, 1917.

<sup>3</sup> Streeter’s “scientific” guess that the author was Aristion, Bishop of Smyrna, would of course fall to be considered only if the work were taken to belong to the reign of Domitian; it is in any case spun out of gossamer. *The Primitive Church*, New York, 1929, pp. 136 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See R. Perdelwitz, *op. cit.* Erster Teil, *Das Literarische Problem*. Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 129–130.

of God" (5, 12) and thus to help them to stand steadfast. In the discourse, which occupies the greater part of his letter, there is no explicit reference to persecution such as we find from 4, 12 to the end; but much is said of sufferings unjustly inflicted, and of the example of Christ, who likewise suffered at the hands of men, though He had done no iniquity, and no guile was found on His lips (2, 21 ff.; 3, 18); and all these thoughts would come home to their hearts with new power, now that the storm of evil had broken over their heads. But persecution is not the theme of the discourse; and its fundamental teaching requires to be studied for itself, independently of the situation which called for its publication in writing. The Epistle as it stands, then, falls into two distinct parts; the Baptismal Discourse on "What it Means to be a Christian," extending from 1, 3 to 4, 11; and the epistolary portion proper, written with direct reference to an actual persecution, consisting only of the Salutation (1, 1-2), and of the section from 4, 12 to the end.

*4. The Task of the Christian Teacher.* The Christian Church was cradled in Judaism, and the first followers of Christ were all Jews. In the course of a few years, with much hesitation and in the face of bitter controversy, it embarked upon its historic mission to the Gentiles, first at the Syrian riverain port of Antioch, then at Caesarea and Tarsus and Damascus, and soon afterwards in the island of Cyprus and on the mainland of Asia Minor. Within the lifetime of the Apostles, it was carried all through the cities of the Greek world and into Italy, and perhaps to Egypt and to Spain. During this first

wave of expansion, the Gospel found access to the Gentiles mainly by way of the synagogue, and drew its converts largely from those who had already heard of the One Living and True God, and had been instructed by Jewish teachers in the moral principles of the Old Testament. The synagogues of the Dispersion cultivated the fields, and the Christian mission reaped the harvest. But after the first generation, the Jewish community settled into an attitude of hostility to the Church, and the synagogues were no longer open to travelling preachers, as they had been to St. Paul. Now the mission was compelled to address itself to unadulterated paganism and to seek converts among people who had not received the benefits of the moral and religious instruction that Judaism had to offer. This instruction had now to be provided by the teachers of the Church; they had to take men reared in paganism, and utterly ignorant of any moral principles higher than those of their environment, and to school them in a new way of life. Having won them to the faith of Christ, they had now to teach them what it meant to live as followers of Christ. The discourse of First Peter is our earliest example of the teaching that was given to these converted pagans when they were admitted to membership in the Christian Church.

*5. The Essential Nature of the New Life in Christ.* The Discourse begins with a magnificent exordium (1, 3-11), a paean of praise to God for the gift of life which He has now bestowed upon them. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has regenerated us unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the

dead." With these words, he teaches them the inward significance of the rite which has just been administered. Baptism is for him no formal ceremony of admission to the Christian society; it is the sacrament of regeneration, wherein God has communicated a new and divine life. As in the thought of St. Paul, the imparting of this new life is connected with the resurrection of Christ. Baptism makes us one with Him; in a symbolic act we die with Him to the old life of earth and are brought by the power of God into a new life of the spirit, centered in heaven. "We are buried with Him through baptism into death, that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too may walk with Him in newness of life" (Romans 6, 4). "If any man be in Christ, there is a new creation; old things are passed away; behold, all things are made new" (2 Corinthians 5, 17). This is the fundamental fact upon which all the teaching of the Discourse is based. With their baptism, the old life of paganism is buried forever, and a new life has begun, a life created within them by God, a life lived in spiritual union with the risen Christ.

As the new life comes from God, so it is directed towards Him in hope and longing. Its affections are set on things above, not on things on the earth. It seeks its fulfilment, not in the sphere of the present, but in the unfolding of God's purpose in the future. God has begotten us "unto a living hope, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and unfading, . . . unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the Last Time." The experience of God's grace that is given to us here and now is but the earnest of that which is reserved

for us in heaven. The Christian life cannot manifest its whole scope and its ultimate significance in the present; it must constantly view itself in the light of eternity. Therefore, hope lies at its very heart; the horizons of earth are too narrow to contain it, and the utmost possibilities of the present are too limited to give it ultimate satisfaction. "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Corinthians 4, 18).

This conception of the Christian life as a "living hope" is really twofold. It recognizes the distinction of two realms of being—the visible and the invisible, the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and the eternal, the natural and the spiritual; and it holds that the life of the Christian has only a passing and as it were incidental relation to the lower sphere, but an essential and permanent relation to the sphere of the spiritual, the invisible, the heavenly. But it combines with this a parallel recognition of the distinction of two ages—that which now is, and that which is to come; and here again it holds that the life of the Christian is cut loose from the trammels of "this present evil age" (Galatians 1, 4), and belongs essentially to the age to come, the age of the Kingdom. It looks forward to the consummation of God's purpose in the creation; to a "salvation ready to be revealed," to "the revelation of Jesus Christ," when the glory of that higher realm of being will break in upon this sorry mundane scheme of things and transform it into the image of the heavenly. The regeneration which has implanted a new life in the Christian is thus seen as a beginning, a "kind of first fruits"

(James 1, 18) of the regeneration of all things, for which the whole creation waits in hope (Romans 8, 19 ff.). The regenerate man is now linked by faith and love to the Christ who is as yet unseen, and in that communion of spirit he "rejoices with joy unspeakable, and suffused with glory," so that he can be said even now to be "receiving the end of the faith, the salvation of the soul." Yet he looks forward to a future in which faith will be superseded by sight, when things unseen as yet will be made manifest, when "the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together" (Isaiah 40, 5). In that hope he accepts the tribulations of the present as tests of the pure metal of his faith, through which he may win the only "praise and honour and glory" which he craves—not that which the world can bestow, but that which is to be given by his Master at His coming.

*6. The New Life as Expressed in Social Intercourse.* Those who have been baptized into the fellowship of Christ must now return to their homes and go about their daily affairs. In the next section of the Discourse, therefore (1, 12-21), he teaches them that the new life which God has implanted in their hearts must issue in a new way of living among men, a transformation in conduct. Though it be predominantly a life of hope, anchored in the unseen and capable of finding its perfect realization only in the future, it must also reflect its divine origin and character in the present, in the temporal and physical circumstances in which they are now placed. Their "conversation" (*ἀναστροφή*), that is, the life which they lead from day to day among their fellows, must not fall into the old pattern of futility which

they inherited from their fathers, when they lived in ignorance of the truth and had no better guide than their own desires. Now they know themselves to be children of God, and obedience to Him must be the rule of all their conduct. He is holy; and His holiness must be their standard, controlling the vagrant impulses of desire. Moreover, the God whom they invoke as Father is also the impartial Judge to whom they must render account; therefore they must live as in His sight, soberly conscious of their responsibility to Him. Finally, he bids them remember the central fact of the Gospel story, that Christ has sacrificed His life to deliver them from their old ways and to bind them to Himself in faith and love. Obedience to God as children to a Father, responsibility to God as to the Judge, and devotion to Christ as to the Redeemer who has purchased them with His blood—these are the foundations upon which he bids them build their life among their pagan neighbors.

In a later part of his Discourse (2, 11-3, 12), he offers more specific instruction in Christian conduct, and suggests yet another motive in the power of a noble life to influence others for good, and to bring them finally to God. The very men who slander Christians as evildoers may have their eyes opened to the truth when they see the beauty of Christian character exhibited in the lives of those whom they accuse (2, 12), and pagan husbands who refuse to believe the Gospel may be won over without a word as they mark the pure goodness of the Christian wife (3, 1-2).

*7. The New Life in the Christian Community.* After baptism, the converts continue to live in the old social environ-

ment, though new moral principles are to govern their conduct. But they are now brought into the fellowship of another community of a different kind, a brotherhood of those that share their faith. This is the theme to which the writer now turns (1, 22-2, 10). He returns again to the thought of baptism, as the sacrament which effects purification of the inward life and regeneration to immortality; they have "purified their souls," and they have been "regenerated, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the living and abiding Word of God." But they are not purified in soul in order to enjoy a solitary holiness, nor are they regenerated of incorruptible seed in order to enjoy a solitary immortality. The Christian teacher here brings forward the remarkable and profound doctrine that the purity and immortality which God bestows issue in the mutual love of the Christian brotherhood. In this social emphasis Christianity stands in marked contrast to all the religions of solitary mysticism, such as Neoplatonism, which seek salvation in a "flight of the alone to the Alone." It has nothing to do with an isolated individualism of experience or of privilege. For the Christian, inward purity in obedience to the truth finds its true expression in "unfeigned love of the brotherhood," and the life that is immortal in its essence is governed by the injunction to "love one another earnestly, from the heart." In Christian thinking, immortality is never conceived in terms of mere duration, apart from the quality and function of the life which is to endure forever. The immortal life which God creates within us through Christ is a life of holiness and love, and it must be lived in the community that God has

formed for it. Thus the most sublime experiences of the soul are linked with the fellowship of all believers; and the higher we are drawn towards God, the closer is our communion with His people.

The nature of this new community and its function in the world are set forth under two figures. It is a "spiritual house," founded upon Christ as the living cornerstone, and built with the lives of His followers, which as "living stones" are set in ordered array about Him, linked by love with Him and with one another. This house is formed "for a holy work of priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ." In these words, he emphasizes that the primary function of the community is worship, and that the heart of its worship lies not in outward ceremonies, but in the offering of "spiritual sacrifices," that is, the perpetual giving of themselves to God, which is the "reasonable service" of all Christians (Romans 12, 1). The second figure represents the Church as the true Israel—the "chosen race" which is in its entirety a "royal priesthood," the "holy nation" that God has taken for His own possession, that it may make known His wonderful works. The once disparate elements, drawn from many different races, are now brought into a wide and deep unity transcending all natural ties and surmounting all the ancient divisions that separate man from man. The basis of the new community is not natural descent or cultural inheritance, but the common experience of God's mercy in regeneration, and the common consecration to His service. There is a boldness in the language which speaks of this society of believers as a *race*, a *nation*, a *people*

(*γένος, ἔθνος, λαός*), when in literal fact it embraced men of "every race and kindred and people and tongue." Yet it must be remembered that the ancient world always thought of religion as the essential basis both of political community and of racial stock, and regarded common religious observances as the central and determining feature of nationhood. The Christian religion, likewise, was not a private cult, like the pagan mysteries, which an individual might follow at his own pleasure without disturbing his status in his racial or national community. The new relationship to God became at once the determining element of all existence to those who shared it, and brought them into a social unity, rooted in spiritual kinship, which was analogous to the unity of race and nation, but on a scale which extended to embrace all mankind.

*8. Christian Duties in Particular Relationships.* Having laid down the broad general principles and attitudes which are to govern the new life of his converts, the teacher now points out the application of these principles in specific situations (2, 11-3, 12). The first two verses of this section form an introduction, linking the stern moral discipline of the inward life, the restraint of the "fleshly lusts which war against the soul," to the manifested beauty of the outward life "among the Gentiles," which may open the eyes of the most vicious opponents of Christianity, and turn their hearts to God. He then speaks (1) of the Christian attitude to the civil power, (2) of the duty of Christian slaves towards their masters, (3) of the duty of Christian wives to their (pagan) husbands, and (4) of the duty of Christian husbands to their

(Christian) wives. Without going into details, we may observe that he never considers the possibility of radical change in the existing social order. The Roman imperial government, the slave system, the power of the husband over the household—all these things he simply accepts as the framework of life within which his people are called to live. The problem of Christian conduct, as he sets it before them, is not in the least to find ways and means for reforming the present order, but to exhibit true goodness in the midst of a situation fraught with evil and with possibilities of the abuse of power. It is his conviction that the present order is in any case shortly to pass away, to give place to the Kingdom of God, and he has no thought of a Christian attempt to remedy its abuses in the brief time that must elapse before it falls under the judgment of God. In all circumstances, the Christian is to govern his conduct, not upon the kindness or cruelty of those who hold authority over him, but upon his own inward relationship to God. In the fear of God, he will subject himself to authority, in accordance with the existing structure of society. For conscience towards God, he will endure punishment, even when he suffers unjustly. Christ is his example, and he will follow in his Master's footsteps, accepting without rebellion the injustice of men towards himself, and committing himself in patience and faith to "Him that judges justly."

*9. Suffering for Righteousness' Sake.* The most difficult portion of the entire book is the last main section of the Discourse (3, 13-4, 6), in which is set forth the meaning of suffering which a Christian man may have to bear, not because

of wrongdoing, but in spite of innocence. Here we must not be distracted by the intrusion of the curious and fascinating doctrine of the Descent (of Christ, not of Enoch!) into Hades, the Harrowing of Hell, and the preaching of the Gospel to the dead (3, 19-20 and 4, 6). This doctrine brings out, in terms congenial to the thought-world of that time, the Christian belief that the saving work of Christ is not confined to His contemporaries or to the life of earth, but that it embraces all that have lived and all that shall live hereafter, and extends from the depths of hell to the heights of heaven for the redemption of fallen angels as well as fallen man. But the central thought of the passage revolves around its first two sentences—"Who is there that will harm you, if you be full of zeal for the good? But even if you were to suffer for righteousness' sake, blessed would you be." The writer is all but certain that a life lived in whole-hearted devotion to Christian principles will not have to suffer. The Christian may be brought before the Roman magistrate and called to a reckoning for the hope that is in him; but if he makes his defense with tranquil gentleness, in the fear of God and in the strength of a clear conscience, he will put his accusers to shame. It is quite evident that the man who could write in this vein had no experience of a persecution which struck at Christians merely for being Christians (as is implied in 4, 12 ff.); he was confident, rather, that the court would acquit them, once they had shown by their words and demeanour that the charges of evil conduct and of sedition were wholly untrue. But in individual cases, there might be a miscarriage of justice, and a Christian might find himself com-

elled to suffer punishment "for righteousness' sake." In the face of such a calamity, he is bidden to hold firmly to the conviction that "should the will of God so ordain, it is better to suffer for doing good than for doing evil." The blessedness promised by the Master will be his portion, and he will be comforted and fortified by the recollection that "Christ also suffered for sins (that were not His own), a just man for unjust men, that He might bring us to God"; and that Christ was in the end triumphantly vindicated, when God raised Him from the dead and exalted Him to the highest place in heaven. The sufferings of the righteous were thus revealed as fulfilling the divine purpose and as leading to a divine reward; in Christ, they are vicarious and redemptive, and they end in exaltation to heavenly glory. Like St. Paul, the writer of this Epistle reckoned "that all the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us" (Romans 8, 18).

But in a more profound approach to the problem, he turns again to the thought of baptism as a dying with Christ and rising with Him to newness of life, as St. Paul had expounded it in Romans 6. "As Christ has suffered in the flesh, do you arm yourselves with the same mind" (4, 1). Here the phrase *παθόντος σαρκί* (having suffered in the flesh) is used in place of the *θανατωθεὶς σαρκί* (put to death in the flesh) of 3, 18,—not to weaken it, but to connect the thought more directly with the problem of suffering, which is the immediate theme. "As Christ died, do you reckon yourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God" (Romans 6, 11). The conception (*έννοια*) which will be an invulnerable armour to them

is the acceptance of the sentence of death within themselves (1 Corinthians 1, 9), the mental apprehension of the moral and spiritual experience of crucifixion with Christ. Suffering, however terrible, cannot be an ultimate terror to those who already "reckon themselves dead," for whom the life in the flesh is but an interim of pilgrimage in an alien land, while the true life which alone they treasure is the life of the spirit, the life that no persecutor can touch because it is "hid with Christ in God" (Colossians 3, 4). It is in this sense that he unfolds the thought of the strong phrase, "baptism now saves you . . . through the resurrection of Jesus Christ"; for in baptism the old life is already given over to death, and the new life is lived in the power of the resurrection, so that death cannot touch it. He that truly understands the faith into which he has been baptized will not fear "them that kill the body and after that have no more that they can do."

The baptismal discourse ends with a final comprehensive exhortation to mutual love and service, culminating in a doxology (4, 7-11). Let us observe that in its whole course, there is not a single allusion to a persecution that is actually raging; there is nothing more than a general preparation for trouble that may at any time have to be faced by Christians in a non-Christian world.

*10. The Letter to the Persecuted—The Salutation.* But this Discourse, as it has come down to us, is embodied in a letter, and the letter is full of allusions to an acute situation of unspeakable terror. Even the formal words of the Salutation (1, 1-2) reflect this atmosphere of tension. Writing now under the name of Peter, the pastor addresses

his threatened people as "elect sojourners of dispersion." In this strange phrase, he brings before their minds a picture of their true situation in a world hostile to them and to the cause for which they stand. They are a Dispersion, like the scattered colonies of Israel, living far from the land of hope and promise. For the time being, they cannot dwell in their true homeland, but they never forget the "Jerusalem which is above," and they are never unmindful of their allegiance to the unseen land where their Master dwells, wherein they hold their true and ultimate citizenship. Upon the earth, they are but sojourners, never feeling that this is their final abiding-place, never truly at home in its social structure, never settling down within it as permanent residents. Their life puts down no roots in the transitory soil of this present world, for it is deep-rooted in the things of eternity. All this is suggested by the phrase "sojourners of dispersion." The word which we render "elect" adds a further element in the picture. In ordinary usage, this word had none of the theological weight which we attach to it. It was used in the sense of "select," "choice," "of high quality." This sense is conveyed here also. The "sojourners of dispersion" are choice souls, rare spirits, picked warriors, who can be counted on to be true to their Master amid perils of torture and of death. But in the vocabulary of Christian teaching, the word undoubtedly takes on the deeper sense of the divine election, the decree of God's eternal will, which has set them in this place of trial and of responsibility. The conviction that they were no playthings of blind fate, but men on whom God had laid His mighty hand for good, was a constant inspiration and

strength to men who lived in jeopardy, facing ordeal by fire, and with no earthly refuge or support.

This thought of the will and purpose of God working itself out in the life of His people, even in the extremity of their sufferings, finds powerful expression in the threefold phrase of the next verse. "According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, by the sanctification of the Spirit, unto the obedience and blood-sprinkling of Jesus Christ."<sup>5</sup> If they are called to live in danger, under the shadow of persecution and the threat of death, they are now reminded that it is not because God has forgotten them or that He has ceased to love. He is still the Father, who knows all things from the beginning, who has known them for His own before He laid the foundations of the universe; and in that mysterious foreknowledge which is nothing else than the predetermined of His purpose of fatherly love, He has seen fit to lead them through this path of trial. His Spirit is still with them to sanctify them, so that they will be purified and not broken by the ordeal through which they pass. And the end of it all is that they are brought "unto the obedience and blood-sprinkling of Jesus Christ." The words look back to the covenant made between Jehovah and Israel in the solemn rite described in Exodus 24, when Moses sprinkled the assembled people with the blood of sacrifice, and they vowed to be obedient. Even so the blood of Jesus Christ, of

fered in sacrifice, has become the seal of an everlasting covenant between God and all that believe. But there is in the words the further thought that God is now calling them to share in the obedience and in the sufferings of His Son. As He was "obedient unto death, even the death of Cross," so they are now called to have part in the same high destiny, that they may be united with Him in the fellowship of His sufferings, and at the last, in the fellowship of His glory. The Salutation concludes with the prayer that grace and peace may be multiplied unto them,—that even in the midst of persecution they may be sustained by an increasing measure of the power and love of God, and that the peace which He bestows may not be disturbed by the experience of the worst that men can do.

11. *The Message to the Persecuted.* The Salutation is followed immediately by the great discourse to the baptized, which we have already studied. Then, with the twelfth verse of chapter four, we find ourselves plunged at once into the tensely anxious days of the first terrible wave of persecution, when the Christian congregations of Asia are bewildered to find themselves suddenly subjected to a fiery ordeal of inquisition, torture, and death. Eager to comfort and strengthen them that they may rally from the fearful shock and stand firm, the writer bids them not to be astounded, as though some strange thing were happening. As followers of Christ, they are made partakers of the sufferings which He Himself endured; and by this recollection, the ordeal of persecution is transmuted into a source of spiritual joy, in the experience of a deeper communion with the Crucified, and in a

<sup>5</sup> The words have every appearance of an interpretative expansion of the baptismal formula; thus they suggest at the outset the thought that the sufferings which the Asian Christians are enduring are to be viewed in the light of the vows which they took at baptism, and the experience of God's power which they then began to receive.

quickened anticipation of the glory to which this path of suffering leads. Men revile them because they name the name of Christ, but this very reviling brings upon them the blessedness that their Master had promised (Matthew 5, 11), for the heavenly presence of the Spirit of God encompasses them with the glory of the divine. But, he warns them, no Christian should afford a genuine justification for the punishments inflicted by the persecuting power, by committing any crime. Such a warning, he felt, was necessary, for many of his people were drawn from among the slaves and the very poor, the submerged classes that easily fell into criminal practices and might now be driven to the worst excesses through sheer despair. But if the punishments of the law should fall upon them, not for any wickedness, but for their loyalty to Christ, let them not feel disgraced at being cast into jail or led off to execution; let them on the contrary glorify God by faithfulness to the holy Name for which they suffer. The havoc and terror of the persecution are so appalling that he is driven to look upon this as the first impact of the Last Judgment. If God then causes His own household of faith to pass through such an ordeal, how much more terrible will be the fate of the wicked when He comes to deal with them? The great Creator is Himself the only Refuge, and those who suffer in accordance with His will may commit their souls to Him in confidence that He will be faithful to their trust.

The Epistle continues (5, 1 ff.) with a special word of exhortation to the leaders of the local communities of Christians, on whom the heaviest responsibility was bound to fall in a time

of crisis. The elders are given commission as shepherds, to feed the flock of God and to set the example of constancy, seeking no earthly reward for their services and claiming no right of mastery over their people, but content to await the Master's praise and the imperishable reward which He will bestow when He manifests Himself in glory. The younger people are urged to follow this faithful leadership of the elders, not putting themselves forward with impatient zeal. For young and old alike, the watchword is to be *πάντες ἀλλήλοις*—“all for one another”—each seeking to be the servant of all.

The exhortations of the following paragraph (vv. 6-11) all seek to lift their thoughts to God that they may see in their present troubles the working of His mighty hand, and may be disciplined in the spirit of humility which alone opens the way to the exaltation of a more intimate communion with Him. They are assured again of His unfailing care, and bidden to cast upon Him the burden of their anxiety. All these persecutions are instigated by the devil; but by steadfast faith in God they may resist and foil him. They must not imagine that Asia alone is feeling the force of the storm; the Christian brotherhood all over the world is undergoing a like experience of persecution. Finally, they are reminded that while the sufferings are fleeting, the glory to which they are called is eternal and divine. God Himself will strengthen and sustain them, and keep them true to Himself.

The mention of Mark and Silvanus and of Rome (Babylon) in the closing greeting is in keeping with the pseudonym which the writer has chosen. The

two companions of St. Paul were, like St. Peter himself, by this time in their graves; and there is no evidence that the letter was known at Rome or anywhere else in the West until the third century.<sup>6</sup> Distance alone would make it unlikely that it could have been sent from Rome. A letter of this character would hardly be sent by the Imperial postal service!—and private communications were slow in the ancient world, even with all the good routes created by Rome. We do not sufficiently appreciate the physical difficulty in the way of imagining a correspondence between Rome and the Asian provinces rapid enough to permit an effective response to an acute situation which had arisen at such a distance. It might be of some help, if we were to remember how long it took St. Paul to travel from Caesarea to Rome, even though he was in the hands of a military guard which was in a position to requisition transportation as it was needed. Under such circumstances, several months might easily pass after the outbreak of persecution in Asia before word of it reached Rome, and it would take an equally long time to send back a letter of exhortation and encouragement. It is far more likely, therefore, that this letter originated somewhere in the area to which it is addressed, than that it came from the distant capital of the Empire.

<sup>6</sup> The one exception is Irenaeus, and he came to Gaul from Asia Minor, perhaps bringing a copy of the Epistle with him.

12. *The Value of the Epistle.* The date, the authorship, and the place of origin of this Epistle are open to question, and many points of interpretation remain matters of debate. Its value to the Church, fortunately, is not in the least dependent on the settlement of these problems of criticism. Whoever the author and whatever the date, the Epistle lies before us as a unique and precious heritage from the first age of our Christian brotherhood. It has a living message for every age in which men seek to live in and for Christ in the midst of a non-Christian world; for it sets forth the high themes of regeneration and immortality, of holiness and love, of humility and submission and perseverance in well-doing, of communion with Christ in life and in death, in the pathway of suffering and in the promise of eternal bliss. And its words take on a new glow of hope and strength in days when the concentration camp, the torture chamber, and the death cell again threaten the man who bears faithful testimony to the truth which he has received. “Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings.” “Blessed are ye, for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.” “The God of all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, will Himself make you perfect and steadfast, and will strengthen you and fix you on a firm foundation. To Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.”

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity.* By Wilfred L. Knox. Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. iv + 108. £2.75.

These Schweich Lectures of the British Academy for 1942, which appear when all too little is being published in the biblical field, are exciting news for the New Testament student. The first of the three lectures notes traces of Hellenistic influence in the grammar, rhetoric and thought of Mark and Luke-Acts, and to it are appended notes on the infancy narratives and the speeches in Acts. The second deals with Hellenistic modes of thought and style in St. Paul, compares his exegetical methods with those of Philo, and then attempts to show how the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel grows out of the "adaptation of Christianity to the general theistic scheme of the first century" (p. 37). A note is added on Philo's use of sources. The final lecture in effect gives the basic materials for a commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the light of Hellenistic theology. Then follow a note on regeneration, an additional note to Lecture I, and six indexes.

The book is too rich in material to be dealt with adequately in a brief space, but we may note some of the conclusions and make a few remarks about them.

(1) Hellenistic influence is clearly found in Mark: artificial rhythmical prose in 14: 38; *ἀχαρτῆρας* in 8: 6; the catalogue of vices in chapter 7. On the other hand, the passage Matt. 11: 25-27 = Luke 10: 21 f., often supposed to be "Hellenistic," is purely Semitic in its phraseology.

(2) Many of Luke's materials, even those with a "developed" theology, betray their Semitic origin, thanks to the evangelist's careless and spotty editing, and his passages of *Kunstprosa* are easily distinguished from the sources. His Virgin Birth story is "peculiarly semitic" rather than Hellenistic, and is of course far less miraculous than Matthew's. Dr. Knox refers to various Semitic legends of miraculous births, including Philo of Byblos' version of the Isaac story. One should point out, however, that the name of Anobret, nymph mother of Ieoud, need not mean "she who conceived by grace"; Baudissin (*Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, II, 154 f.)

suggests 'ayin obereth, "overflowing spring." The note on the speeches in Acts supplements Cadbury's previous studies. Knox thinks the decree of the Apostolic Council is probably genuine and stands by his previous view that there is historical fact behind Paul's speeches in Lystra and Athens. The fact that Acts 20: 35 is a floating logion, not found in Luke, is no argument against the companion of Paul having been author of the whole work. I should add here that, whoever the author is, he might have known of many floating logia, and would not feel it necessary to include every one of them in his book.

(3) St. Paul need not have acquired his Greek education in Tarsus; Greek studies were carried on in Jerusalem, according to Jewish tradition. (When the lectures were written, Knox did not yet have access to Saul Lieberman's *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, which develops this point further.) Rom. 1: 18 ff. exhibits a knowledge of the commonplaces of Greek philosophy. Paul resembles Philo in his use of Old Testament proof texts, and this is no doubt because the Greek schools of Jerusalem and Alexandria had similar methods.

(4) Philo and the great Apostle represent parallel Hellenistic developments in their Logos and Wisdom theologies.

It is at least possible that the Greek schools of Jerusalem were already accustomed to the substitution of the creative Wisdom of Prov. 8 for the Messiah in preaching to the Greek world, Wisdom again being equated with the Torah, though it remains possible that St. Paul arrived independently at the equation of the Messiah with the Logos on the strength of ideas which were generally current at the time when he wrote. It is probable that this equation was decisive for the preservation of monotheism. Jesus as the creative Logos-Wisdom of Judaism could be represented as one with the supreme God; as a saviour he would in the hellenistic world have been in danger of becoming merely one of many saviours (p. 41).

This explains why the term "saviour" is applied to Jesus only in the latest New Testament books. In the Fourth Gospel he fulfills the same function as Philo's Logos, but it is absurd to suppose that John depends directly on Philo; both drew on a common stock of midrashic tradition. At this point Knox makes no reference to Bultmann's *Das Evangelium*

des Johannes, which on pp. 8 f. makes a very similar statement; copies of it have probably not reached England. The German critic devotes considerable space to the relation between gnosticism and the Logos-Creator-Revealer-Redeemer of John, and concludes that John's Logos must belong to an early stage of gnostic development since the Creation does not involve a sinful fall. Knox recognizes that "the evangelist's language is largely borrowed from the pessimistic view which saw in the flesh and the material the source of evil," but "none the less 'flesh' could be assumed by the Logos for the simple reason that the evangelist is entirely clear that the historical Jesus was the revelation of God to the world and is entirely unconcerned with speculations as to the origin of evil" (pp. 57 f.). The latter explanation seems simpler and less tortured.

(5) While recognizing that the Fourth Gospel is made up of other important elements—the older Christian tradition and Jewish rabbinical theology, for example—Dr. Knox finds that from start to finish the Logos idea controls the presentation. This is in sharp contrast to Colwell's contention that the Logos theology belongs only to the prologue. The absence of the term Logos is, of course, a difficulty, and I have usually thought it better to speak of a "revealer-redemeer" idea. Nevertheless, Knox shows that Philo's ideas illuminate the gospel at many points, and the Logos doctrine is integral to Philonic thought. It is, of course, possible to be over-subtle in exegesis, and when Knox explains the Samaritan woman's six husbands by saying that six is the number of the material world, I cannot follow him. It is hardly better than Loisy's reference to the gods of the five nations settled in Samaria. One can almost never tell what the symbolic significance of a number is, if indeed it has any.

(6) The Fourth Gospel must have been written before 100 (120 at the very latest), and its theology demands a date after 90 A.D., unless "the resemblances between this Gospel and the Pauline Epistles including the post-Pauline Ephesians are due not to borrowing but to a common use of the accepted language and outlook of first-century Christianity, in which case the Gospel might be dated some twenty or thirty years earlier" (p. 90, n.). Dr. Knox thinks that Christian thought has undergone

considerable development by the time it is written, and presumably he would not subscribe to Goodenough's thesis in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIV (1945), 145-182, that John is "a primitive gospel."

Specialists in Philo will no doubt have much to say about these lectures. They contain a mine of information and cannot be neglected by any professional student.

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON  
Episcopal Theological School

*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Volume LV.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944, pp. 119. \$2.00.

This volume of the Harvard Studies is of especial interest to the student of ancient Christianity because of the subjects of the two essays which make up most of its content: Joshua Whatmough's "KEATIKA" and K. K. Hulley's "Principles of Textual Criticism known to St. Jerome." The latter is particularly valuable for its bearing on the history of biblical interpretation.

The language of ancient Gaul might appear to be a topic remote from Christian origins, but it is related to the preaching of Irenaeus, as Whatmough notes (p. 71; his statement that "Irenaeus . . . is said to have studied Keltic, perhaps with the intention of preaching in that language" gains definiteness by reference to Irenaeus' text [I, 6 Harvey]: "we who live among Kelts and are occupied with [i.e., use] that barbarian dialect"). Not all Christians in Gaul were so occupied; the ones named in the epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne have Greek or Latin names, and at least two, like Irenaeus himself, came from Asia Minor. It is possible, however, that their native tongue was Keltic to. Linguistically must not the situation at Lyons have been much like that at Antioch, where Aramaic and Greek were spoken? Eventually an entirely different situation came into existence; "Latin was undoubtedly the common language of Gaul, as of the western Empire as a whole, by the third or fourth centuries, especially wherever Christianity was introduced" (p. 72).

The second essay, condensed from a doctoral dissertation, summarizes Jerome's views on lower and higher criticism in a very systematic way. The result is probably much more systematic than Jerome's own thought. It must

be remembered, as Hulley points out (p. 90), that Jerome was primarily a translator. Some rather minor points require correction. His remark on Cavallera's work (p. 92, n. 40) is too briefly stated; it seems to imply that the readings *καυθήσουσαι* and *καυχήσουσαι* are to be found in Galatians, whereas of course they are in I Cor. 13: 3. The *Exegesis of the Dominical Oracles* of Papias should not be called "a catalog" (p. 106); and Porphyry should not be called Porphyrio (p. 107, n. 126), as if he were some minor character in Shakespeare.

ROBERT M. GRANT

*University of the South*

*Humanism and Human Dignity.* By Luther Winfield Stalnaker. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945, pp. iv + 58. \$1.00

In a day of world catastrophe when destruction and devastation obscure the purpose of human life there is a definite need for vindication of human personality. The greatest peril is not physical destruction but the annihilation of faith in human worth and human capacity. Totalitarian ideologies are not primarily political and economic. They are philosophical and religious. Their roots are imbedded in the absolutism of the Hegelian tradition. The purpose of human effort is annulled because "there is no evil for man to overcome, no time in which to strive, no freedom with which to wage the battle."

The author feels that humanism is the champion of man against cosmic absorption. The term generally has been employed as an antithesis of theism. The author, however, uses it as an antithesis to absolutism.

The representatives of absolutism especially chosen for consideration are three neo-Hegelians: F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet, and Josiah Royce. They have been selected because they represent in common the absolutist position with interesting individual emphases. The representatives of humanism are William James and F. C. S. Schiller. The exposition of the absolutists is considerably fuller than that of the humanists for the reason that the author himself belongs to the latter school and in defending their position is expounding his own.

Against the rationalism of absolutism, humanism protests vigorously. To the humanist, the arguments of the absolutists are the rankest abstractions. A classic illustration of the

doctrine of the humanists is expressed by William James in his *Will to Believe* as follows: "Our passionate nature not only lawfully may, but must, decide an option between propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot by its nature be decided on intellectual grounds; for to say, under such circumstances, 'Do not decide, but leave the question open,' is itself a passionate decision, just like deciding yes or no, and is attended with the same risk of losing the truth."

From this we can understand the reluctance of the humanist to commit himself to a metaphysic. The humanist endeavors to construct a "real" world which will conserve ultimate values. "At a blow it [Humanism] awards to the ethical conception of Good supreme authority over the logical conception of True and the metaphysical conception of Real."

In the humanistic position the corollaries for time, freedom, and evil are rather obvious. For the humanist, each has a meaning *per se* and each maintains an existence in a fundamental sense in its own right. Humanism, being voluntaristic and personalistic, declares the time-process to be a fundamental characteristic even of the mind and its development. And since the universe can be intelligible through no other source, time must assume the proportion of an ultimate datum.

On the corollary of freedom, humanism declares that "human action is endowed with real agency and really makes a difference alike to the system of truth and to the world of reality."

Humanism negatively pronounces its doctrine of evil by repudiation of absolutism's strict interpretation of "God's omnipotence." This interpretation makes evil a "mere appearance." And this would rob our moral struggle of all meaning. But humanism's presupposition of a pluralistic universe with alternatives of genuine freedom yields a rationale for our experience of the conflict of goods.

LESTER V. WILEY

*Hollywood, Calif.*

*Clinical Pastoral Training.* Edited by Seward Hiltner. New York: Commission on Religion and Health, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1945, pp. xvi + 176. \$1.00.

*Clinical Pastoral Training* is the first and the only text that attempts to portray the various

Protestant programs for training clergy in Pastoral Care. It is, therefore, a significant work and by fulfilling its purpose well makes an important contribution to church life and thought. It is well past time for the appearance of such a book.

The editor has contented himself with two tasks: first, to report the substance of the papers read by leaders of pastoral training programs at the first National Conference on Clinical Training held in Pittsburgh in 1944; and second, to summarize in cogent form the discussions held at that conference. Therefore, the book is akin to "minutes of the previous meeting," which naturally leaves an unsalutary effect upon the unity of the whole but nevertheless presents the real experience and thinking of pastoral training leaders and reveals clearly the development and present importance of the various programs.

The main pastoral training programs represented throughout the publication are the Graduate School of Applied Religion, the New England Group, the Council for Clinical Training, and the program of the Philadelphia Divinity School. The development of each is portrayed in papers by their leaders and the total developmental experience is summed up by the editor in a delightful analogy based on the development of an individual person, complete with amusing yet pertinent references to the Gestation Period, the Birth, the Crawling and Early Walking Stages, and Early Adolescence. The insights of the editor in this general review of clinical pastoral training are themselves worth the price of the volume.

This presentation of the development of the programs is concluded with a reporting of the conference discussion of the presentation. Through the rest of the book, each aspect of clinical pastoral training is treated in a parallel fashion, set forth first by papers and then by discussion, and the other phases treated thus include: standards for pastoral training; the relation of this training to theological schools, to other kinds of pastoral education, and to pastoral vocations; and the relation of this training to post-war needs. For this complete review twenty-five papers are quoted and ten of the conference discussions are reported. The net effect is one of almost complete coverage of a movement that has assumed a great and just importance in the churches today, yet it is a coverage like a modern theater's mar-

que—complete, but replete beneath with much repetition of a central theme. This is natural, however, wherever many authors contribute.

As a reference book for clinical pastoral training programs, this publication is valuable, however, and not alone because it is unique. As a collection of the best thought on the future development and purposes of clinical pastoral training it is equally important. For both purposes, it is a book with which church people would do well to be familiar, since it convincingly argues that its programs are not any longer peripheral schools of thought on the fringe of theological learning but, in the words of Everitt C. Herriek: "It is theology. A theology that is not only good, but also not too abstruse for human nature's daily use. That is the kind of theology that every pastor needs."

J. BROOKE MOSLEY

Department of Christian Social Relations,  
Diocese of Washington

*The Two-Edged Sword.* By Norman F. Langford. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1945, pp. 194. \$2.00.

This book of sermons by one of the brilliant younger ministers of the United Church of Canada is his first, but in view of the promise implicit in every chapter it will not be his last. The thought throughout is heavily freighted with judgment and crisis, and breathes an evangelical fervor which naturally emerges from the preacher's consciousness of the terrifying tensions between the Word and the world situation. The Gospel to be preached today, and the only gospel, is that of faith in Jesus Christ who has the power to save individual lives and to supply the remedy for the social situation at any one moment in history, but not to redeem society as such. "The gospel that the Church carries is a torch thrust out into the darkness so that some at least may see how dark it is away from the light." This dour outlook springs consistently, however, from his emphasis on the hopelessness and natural depravity of human nature. Like Paul, whose gospel is the "Word" for him, he strongly underscores sin. All are concluded under sin, sin alone is responsible for all that ails the world and deliverance is to be had only by justifying faith in Jesus Christ, and it is not certain that there will be many to find the way

out. In consequence every sermon is Christ-centered, and with a high view of the Church as the instrument employed by God for man's salvation.

The homiletical method is uniformly exegetical. The young preacher shows rare insights which will please the biblical scholar and preacher despite the literalism with which he handles his texts and a certain naïveté illustrated by this sentence from the sermon *The Sign in the Sky*, "The rainbow spread across the heavens was something big enough for God to look at." While the sermons were not originally written for publication, there is a unity and even a progress in the thought in the sermons selected, which successfully ties them together so that one reads along with anticipation and increasing interest. They are not all equally good but we liked best the three sermons on *The Woman of Samaria* and the *Thanksgiving sermon*, *The Glory of the Harvest*. On every page there is indication of real power, as might be expected from one who so demonstrably knows how both to think and write. The style is characterized by a rugged directness and a clarity of expression, the whole being lighted up with a happy use of figurative language and with sentences that stick in the mind.

HENRY H. SHIRES

*Church Divinity School of the Pacific*

*The Jehovah's Witnesses.* By Herbert Hewitt Stroup. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. x + 180. \$2.50.

There is already available some literature, written by outsiders, which attempts to study the group founded by Pastor Charles T. Russell, led for so many years by Judge Joseph F. Rutherford, and now headed by N. H. Knorr. But this monograph by a sociologist of Brooklyn College is the most complete and authoritative treatment now available. The Witnesses give out practically no statistical information, and their dislike of investigators, combined with efficient hierarchical control, prevents the

gathering of many facts which sociologists and historians would like to have. Mr. Stroup's principal sources are the multifarious publications of the organization and his personal contacts with hundreds of leaders and followers. Perhaps his study is all the more valuable because it depends so largely on personal observation.

Certainly there is much here to enlighten the sociologist and psychologist of religion, even though many of the patterns are familiar, and the book will be useful not only to those who come in direct contact with Jehovah's Witnesses, but to all pastors who work among underprivileged people. Mr. Stroup has much to say about the doctrine of the Witnesses, but he does not attempt to place it in its setting in the American religious scene; that is a separate task which awaits other investigators. Nor does he attempt the interesting and delicate task of comparing the movement with primitive Christianity. (One may note in passing that while the Witnesses share something of the same world-view, and manifest the same willingness to undergo obloquy and martyrdom, and the same missionary zeal, they do not engage in the same practical works of charity.) Finally, one regrets the absence of a treatment of the curious influence of theological scholarship on the Witnesses. They make some use of modern translations and of critical editions of the Greek New Testament; they are anti-Trinitarian, and Arius is one of their heroes. Yet they manifest little interest in the historical Jesus; at least they seldom mention his name, save in the combination "Christ Jesus."

These omissions are understandable in view of the book's declared purpose. Yet some theological study of the movement is called for, not merely for historical reasons, and not with a view to polemic writing (which would probably be ineffective), but for an understanding of the mind of the American masses among whom the practising theologian must work.

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

*Episcopal Theological School*

## NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

*Prophecy and the Church.* By Oswald T. Allis. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1945, pp. ix + 339. \$2.50.

The author has given us a well-documented discussion of millenarianism in its various ramifications and an attempted refutation from the viewpoint of what we may call normative Biblical fundamentalism. Whatever value the book will have for students of the Bible with the historical viewpoint will be found in this first aspect. More than a century ago the modern millennial impetus began with Darby and the Plymouth Brethren Movement. The present vogue is to be seen from the fact that over 2,000,000 copies of the Schofield Reference Bible, "the Bible of Dispensationalists," have been printed since 1909. Prof. Allis's attempts to meet this situation solely upon the basis of the fundamentalist position. For him it is a problem within the ranks of the "evangelical" faith. Any historical-critical approach to the Old Testament is ruled out of court in the preface where the author calls upon both wings of fundamentalism "to stand shoulder to shoulder in their opposition to Modernism and Higher Criticism." Yet the only adequate solution to the problem Prof. Allis has considered is to be found in this third approach. The prophets spoke primarily to the Israel of their day. What value their messages have for us, and in part they convey to us ultimate truth, can be ascertained most effectively by a consideration of the historical circumstances which conditioned them. They possess eternal overtones, but it is only in realizing that they are overtones that we draw from them the proper insights.

C. C. R.

*Life in the Church.* By DuBose Murphy. Louisville: The Cloister Press, 1945, pp. x + 125. \$0.75.

I have always had an aversion to confirmation manuals. Usually they contain too little religion and too much about the mechanics of the Christian year, vestments, symbols and the like. I have sometimes said to anyone who would listen that one might better take the Gospel of Mark or Luke as a syllabus for con-

fimation lectures. But there is little in this book that I can criticize adversely. It starts out with "Our Promise and God's Gift," and then goes on to deal with Prayer and the Bible, and only after this indispensable preparation does Mr. Murphy take up the Book of Common Prayer and the Church. The manual is sane, sensible, adult and interesting. As the author himself admits, the chapter on Doctrine is not full enough. The mediaeval Church of England is pictured as too Anglican (M. W. Patterson said it was *papalissima*). Nevertheless, the next time I have someone to prepare for confirmation I shall put this book in his hands.

S. E. J.

*Stewards of the Mysteries of Christ.* By W. Norman Pittenger. Louisville: Cloister Press, pp. viii + 60. \$0.50.

For quite some time there was but little acceptable material which might be put in the hands of young men who were considering the ministry and which would help to answer their many questions. Within the past few years there have been published several good pamphlets which discuss the ministry in a popular way. However the inevitable limitation of space in a pamphlet left many important things unsaid.

The author of the above smallish paperbound book has essayed to fill the gap with something a little more substantial. He has succeeded in presenting a treatment of the Ministry which ought to commend itself both in content and readability to college men who are "inquirers."

The considerable emphasis of this book on the sacerdotal functions of the Ministry, and more particularly the minister as the celebrant of the Eucharist, might be regarded as an overstressing of the priestly office at the expense of the prophetic and pastoral. However it would seem to be a much needed corrective for the neglect of this aspect of the ministry in the bulk of our current literature on the subject.

Of special note also is the chapter which discusses the wide variety of work engaged in by the ministry, pointing out clearly that there is room in the ministry of the Church for men of diverse gifts.

A. D. K.





## A Note by the Editor

The ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is now in its twenty-seventh year. It represents a labor of love on the part of a group of scholars in the Protestant Episcopal Church who have kept it going, now for over a quarter-century. It has never had, and has not now, any "overhead" of any kind—salaries, expense accounts, or staff. Its only expenses are for the printing and distribution of the REVIEW. Its resources include subscriptions, a small income from advertising (of theological seminaries), and annual cash contributions made by members of the Editorial Board and the Cooperating Institutions—eight theological seminaries, the Church Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Trinity College. Since 1927, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary has generously provided an office for the REVIEW. It has always been solvent, and continues solvent today, in spite of years of depression and of general economic disturbance. It was founded during World War I, and we do not intend to let it expire during World War II.

It exists to serve the Episcopal Church and specifically the theological interests of its clergy and other members. But it is also read by many persons outside the Episcopal Church; a large proportion of the subscribers are libraries, public, college and university, and theological. To all alike it seeks to interpret the Anglican tradition and outlook in theology, a tradition and an outlook which combine wide freedom with firm conviction, comprehension with Catholicity, broad sympathy and understanding with a basic loyalty to the Christian faith "as this Church hath received the same."

Scholarly, authoritative articles by writers of recognized rank; book reviews and notes on new books by experts in their several fields; Notes and Comments, for briefer and sometimes technical contributions; the quarterly *syllabi* of the Church Congress, widely used by study groups throughout the Church—these characterize the ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

Your subscription is earnestly solicited, if you are not now a subscriber. And if you are in a position to share with us in subsidizing the REVIEW, a larger contribution will be most welcome.

*Subscriptions and financial contributions* should be sent to the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

*Contributed articles* should be sent to the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

*Book reviews* should be sent to the Rev. Sherman E. Johnson, 6 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

For reprints of *Church Congress syllabi*, address the Rev. Ralph D. Read, Secretary, 207 Farmington Ave., Hartford, Connecticut.

Inquiries relating to *back numbers* of the REVIEW, including sets (a very few sets are still in stock), should be addressed to the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

# The General Theological Seminary

Chelsea Square : New York 11, N. Y.

*Under the control of the General Convention*

Three-year undergraduate course of prescribed and elective study.

Four-year course for graduates, offering larger opportunities for specialization.

Provision for more advanced work, leading to degrees of S.T.M. and D.Th.

*For catalogue and further details address*

**THE DEAN**

**1 CHELSEA SQUARE**

**NEW YORK 11, N. Y.**

## Berkeley Divinity School

FOUNDED 1854

80 Sachem Street  
New Haven, Conn.

Affiliated with Yale University

For information address

**REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, DEAN**

## Seabury-Western Theological Seminary



**A Graduate School of  
Theology**

formed by the union of  
Seabury Divinity School and  
Western Theological Seminary



For Catalogue and Additional  
Information Address

**The Dean**

*600 Haven Street      Evanston, Illinois*

